DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 035 070 EA 002 648

AUTHOR	Cunningham, Luvern L.; Nystrand, Raphael O.
TITLE	Citizen Participation in School Affairs. A Report to the Urban Coalition.
INSTITUTION	Urban Coalition.
PUB DATE	Jun 69
NOTE	131p.
EDRS PRICE	EDRS Price MF-$0.75 HC-$6.65
DESCRIPTORS	*Citizen Participation, *Community Action, Community Influence, Decision Making, Educational Interest, *Leadership Qualities, Mechanics (Process), Program Effectiveness, *School Activities, Urban Areas, *Urban Schools

ABSTRACT

This research assesses new arrangements for citizen participation in urban school affairs within the 13 cities studied. An effort was made to learn who participates and whom they represent, the forum for participation, the issues considered, the tactics used by participants, the sanctions available to participants, the success of the program, and the strengths and weaknesses of the mechanism as perceived by interested parties. Recommendations derived from the study encourage the strengthening of existing linkages for citizen participation and point out the need for new methods especially to involve poor and minority groups. In those cities where mechanisms for citizen participation were working well, leadership was emerging within the schools as well as in the community to solve educational problems. The results seemed to satisfy both school officials and citizens. (LN)

ED035070

Citizen Participation in School Affairs

A Report to the Urban Coalition

By
Luvern L. Cunningham
Dean, College of Education
Ohio State University
and
Raphael O. Nystrand
Assistant Professor
College of Education
Ohio State University

June 1969

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

EA 002 648

Table of Contents

Page

Foreword iii

Preface v

Introduction 1

- Citizen influence in urban schools 3
- The focus of this study 7

Observations Regarding Citizen Participation 12

- The purposes of citizen participation 12
- The problem of representativeness 21
- Citizen participation strategies 28
- Citizen effectiveness 35
- Dimensions of leadership 38
- School system response 45
- Third party roles and functions 51
- Summation 56

Recommendations 57

- New forms of citizen participation should be encouraged to promote educational accountability to the public 58
- Communities must find new approaches to leadership development especially for education 65
- School systems must establish and refine new linkages to other sources of strength within their communities 69

Page

Recommendations (continued)

Existing structures for citizen participation must be strengthened 75

Leadership and sanctioning agencies should encourage citizen participation in school affairs 79

Some Random and Concluding Thoughts 80

Appendix 83

Atlanta, Georgia 84

Boston, Massachusetts 86

Chicago, Illinois 89

Columbus, Ohio 91

Detroit, Michigan 94

Duluth, Minnesota 97

Huntsville, Alabama 100

Los Angeles, California 103

New York, New York 105

Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 111

Rochester, New York 114

Rockford, Illinois 116

San Francisco, California 121

Foreword

Serious conflict between city school bureaucracies and parents is becoming widespread. At issue in many of these conflicts is the question of how citizens are to participate in the governance of city school districts. A surprising parochialism characterizes many of these conflicts, as each city fights out its own battles without apparent reference to conflicts and solutions in other cities.

The Urban Coalition contracted during 1968 with Dr. Luvern Cunningham, Dean of the College of Education, Ohio State University, to conduct an assessment of existing arrangements for citizen participation in educational decision making.

The study team under Dr. Cunningham consisted of professors of political science and of education administration at Ohio State and at several other universities, and also included persons with recent experience in urban school-community relations. Each of thirteen cities was visited by two or more members of the team for interviews with school and community leaders.

The team evaluated what it observed in terms of the approaches which appear to lead to constructive citizen participation at school, neighborhood, and city levels, including proposals for third party mediation capability.

The team also examined ways in which the concept of school accountability to the public can be used as a foundation upon which citizen participation efforts can effectively be channeled.

This report is being distributed by the Urban Coalition as a public service to offer an independent assessment of current activities and problems in the field of citizen participation.

The Urban Coalition
1819 H Street, N. W.
Washington, D. C.
June 1969

Preface

The purpose of this report is to present an overview of new mechanisms for involving citizens in educational affairs. Pressure to create new ways for citizens to participate in school decision making in cities is increasingly apparent. Citizens and school people in one locale are frequently unaware of problems and efforts similar to their own in other parts of the country. This report is offered as partial remedy to this condition and is intended for a diverse audience. We hope that all persons, laymen and school officials, interested in emerging forms of citizen participation, will find the descriptions, observations, and recommendations presented herein useful to them.

Many persons contributed to the preparation of this report and we are grateful to all of them for their assistance. We wish especially to thank the large number of citizens and school personnel who cooperated so generously with us in the field. Their help made the report possible.

Members of the study team responsible for doing the field work and preparing case studies about each of the cities were James H. Andrews, Ohio State University; Virgil Blanke, Ohio State University; Conrad Briner, Claremont Graduate School; Joseph M. Cronin, Harvard University; Roy A. Larmee, Ohio State

University; R. Bruce McPherson, University of Chicago; Michael J. Murphy, Claremont Graduate School; Arliss L. Roaden, Ohio State University; Robert T. Stout, Claremont Graduate School; Michael D. Usdan, Teachers College, Columbia University; and Bernard C. Watson, Philadelphia Public Schools. Their insightful descriptions and analyses provided the bases for the preparation of this document.

Assistance with interviewing and report preparation at Ohio State was provided by Donald P. Anderson, Carl Ashbaugh, Jean Emmons, and Charles Taylor.

James Andrews, Robert Brown, Jack Culbertson, and Arliss Roaden read sections of the manuscript and offered helpful comments.

Responsibility for interpretation of the data and the observations and recommendations which appear in the report rests with the authors.

The field work of the study team was carried out during the summer and fall of 1968 and the final report was completed in January, 1969.

L.L.C.

R.O.N.

Introduction

Citizen participation is a cherished concept in the ideology of public education. Educators and laymen alike have commonly acknowledged that a responsibility of the public schools is to teach what the public wishes or, in the jargon of the profession, to reflect the society which they serve.

Careful observers note many similarities among schools in different locales and attribute them to state and national influences upon public school development. In the minds of most people, however, schools are local institutions to be run according to local wishes. Virtually any suggestion that policy making responsibilities for local schools be shifted to a higher government level or even brought under the broader umbrella of general municipal government has encountered determined resistance among local publics.

The most important formal means of expressing citizen expectations for public schools has been through local boards of education. Although they are technically state officials, local board of education members usually are elected by local voters or appointed by public officials who, in turn, are elected by the community. The theory of local control holds that such selection procedures produce boards of education which are representative of the public and that decisions made by these bodies reflect the public will. An essential element of this theory is that individual citizens or local groups can and do influence board of education decisions by making their views known before the entire board or to individual members. A more direct but less frequent means of citizen participation has been through public referenda. On questions involving the expenditure of public funds, citizens often can express themselves by voting for or against the renewal or increase of operating tax levies and the authorization of bond issues for capital improvements. In effect, this practice allows local citizens to veto board of education proposals for large scale capital expansion or changes in local school programs.

The other side of citizen participation in public school decision-making has been informal and, in some respects, as significant as electing board of education members. The crux of the neighborhood school value, which is so dear to many citizens, is the conviction that informal citizen controls can be employed successfully at that level. Schools in the child-centered culture of suburbia provide the best example of this phenomenon. Many suburban neighborhoods are characterized by substantial homogeneity of expectations for schools and frequent informal contacts among parents, school administrators and teachers, many of whom live or perhaps even grew up in the community where they now teach. Administrators select teachers who can "fit into the community" and school programs cater to parent interests whether they be for bi-lingual fifth graders, getting students ready for college or winning football teams.

Board of education elections in suburbia often are uncontested because members of the board and their employees respond so effectively to the informal exercise of citizen influence that little demand exists to replace incumbent policy-makers.[1] However, situations in which educational controversies do develop in suburbia also are instructive. In these instances, the issues usually become clear-cut, board elections are hotly contested, and the defeat of incumbent board members signals a marked change in local school policies.[2] The point is that one way or another suburban residents generally can assure the responsiveness of local school officials.

Citizen influence in urban schools

Big city residents typically have had somewhat less voice than suburbanites in affecting decisions made by local school authorities. The process of urbanization has been marked by several factors which have diluted the effectiveness of traditional means for achieving lay participation in school affairs. The most obvious of these is population growth. Whereas the seven member board of education in Suburbia or Centerville, U.S.A. probably has fewer than 15,000 constituents, the same number of board members serve more than three million residents in Los Angeles. Simple arithmetic strongly suggests that city board members can have personal contacts with a smaller proportion of their constituents than their suburban and rural counterparts. But representation is more than a matter of manageable numbers. The populations of our large cities reflect great heterogeneity. Almost without exception, the poor and minority groups which comprise a significant part of these populations are under-represented on city boards of education. These same citizens often consider established authority so alien and unsympathetic that they hesitate to approach unknown board of education members who might welcome their interest.

---

[1] David W. Minar, "School, Community, and Politics in Suburban Areas," in Education in Urban Society, edited by B. J. Chandler, Lindley J. Stiles and John I. Kitsuse. (New York: Dodd, Mead and Company, 1962) pp. 90-104.

[2] This conclusion was reached on the basis of several studies done at the Claremont Graduate School. These studies and their implications are discussed by Laurance Iannacconne, Politics in Education. (New York: The Center for Applied Research in Education, 1967). pp. 82-98.

The problem is complicated further by the lack of control which city board of education members actually have over school system affairs. In the process of serving large numbers of clients, employing many workers, and processing vast amounts of data, city school systems have become complex bureaucratic structures. Boards of education see only the "top of the iceberg." They make judgments on the basis of information which comes up from the system, and their decisions can be and sometimes are subverted by numerous functionaries.[3] Moreover the countervailing pressures which have developed within some school bureaucracies pose further constraints upon school board decision-making latitude. Teacher organizations afford the most important example in the present context. Organized initially to support "bread and butter" demands from the board of education, teacher organizations in some cities have become powerful sources of resistance to certain kinds of expanded citizen participation in school affairs.

Finally, the bureaucratization of city school systems and urban population trends have decimated the effectiveness of informal citizen influence upon schools in many neighborhoods. City-wide curricula and generalized policy pronouncements from the central office can be deterrents to developing programs which respond to particular neighborhood needs.[4] In most city neighborhoods, school employees are itinerants who spend little time in the community when school is not in session. Residents in some of these neighborhoods are hostile or indifferent. Many have little or no knowledge about how to approach and work with school people. In contrast with their suburban counterparts, inner-city teachers and administrators are less likely to share the values of their clientele or to have informal associations which build their sensitivity to local concerns. In situations such as these, special efforts must be made for citizens to participate meaningfully in local school affairs. Not many city schools and neighborhoods have developed successful arrangements to this end.

---

[3] Marilyn Gittell. Participants and Participation. (New York: Center for Urban Education, 1967) and Joseph Pois. The School Board Crisis. (Chicago: Educational Methods, Inc., 1964.)

[4] Morris Janowitz and David Street. Final Report, Russell Sage Foundation Project. (Chicago: University of Chicago, 1965.)

The declining viability of traditional modes of citizen participation is one dimension of contemporary urban school crises. A parallel dimension is the growing realization among poor and minority group citizens of just how important the schools are to their destiny and that of their children. The hope which this recognition inspires has been frustrated in many quarters by evidence that local schools attended primarily by poor and minority group students have average achievement levels substantially lower than those of white middle-class schools in the same city.

A response to these conditions by neighborhood leaders which has growing popular appeal is to call for increased citizen participation in school affairs. To some leaders, this is an appeal for closer home-school cooperation and consultation in school program decisions. To others, however, it is a demand to seize control of neighborhood schools from city officials and place it squarely in the hands of neighborhood leaders. As one ghetto leader told us, "The city board has run a system which prepares our children to read at the ninth percentile on national tests; we certainly could do no worse!"

In summary, many city residents find themselves without access to school decision-makers at a time when decisions made in schools have taken on new significance for them. Simultaneously, many well-intentioned administrators find it difficult to structure effective ways for citizens to participate in school affairs. Such conditions have led to conflict in instances where aggressive citizens and defensive school bureaucracies have clashed over the issue of who will make what decisions about the schools. In other cities, this issue has not yet been joined, and school officials hesitate to confront it. In still other cities, new and seemingly workable arrangements for enlarging the scope of citizen participation are in various stages of development.

The Focus of This Study

This report summarizes the results of a quick and loosely-structured effort to assess existing arrangements for citizen participation in urban school affairs. In response to a request from the Urban Coalition, a study team brought together at Ohio State University sought to identify, describe, and evaluate unique and/or promising mechanisms for citizen participation. Our responsibility was to describe and assess the potential of new mechanisms rather than to evaluate the effectiveness of traditional institutions such as boards of education. Similarly, we were asked to direct our attention to mechanisms dealing with school affairs thereby excluding from our attention policy review boards and other vehicles to enlarge citizen participation in other institutional sectors. We took as our working definition of citizen participation "activity of lay citizens which influences operating decisions made by school authorities." From the outset, we were interested in both mechanisms which were created or sponsored by school officials and those which developed independently of the school system but provoked reaction from it. Accordingly, we considered a mechanism "promising" if it exhibited potential to effect citizen initiated and/or endorsed changes in the school system. It should be noted that our working definitions included no references to the particular educational or social merit of such changes. Our intention was to look first for mechanisms with potential to accomplish change. The nature of changes brought about by persons working through particular mechanisms was addressed as an independent question.

The initial task was to identify cities in which promising mechanisms are located. Limitations of time and resources precluded a search process utilizing systematic survey procedures. We relied instead upon the "grapevine technique." Contacts were made with personnel in the U. S. Office of Education and the U. S. Office of Economic Opportunity, staff members of various educational organizations with a declared interest in citizen participation, foundation representatives, university professors in all parts of the country, and a number of school administrators. We explained our interest to each of them and asked if they knew of or had heard about mechanisms which we should investigate. The cities included in our sample were selected on the basis of these nominations and a series of follow-up telephone calls and visits. Deliberate effort was made to select cities of varying size and from different parts of the country.

Certainly no claim can be made that this very unscientific selection procedure located the most promising mechanisms in the nation or even that all cities which merited consideration were brought to our attention. From the perspective of the study team, however, the problem was not so much one of narrowing the field of eligible cities as it was of finding thirteen cities of varying size and region where promising mechanisms were present. Although some cities where interesting mechanisms exist were excluded from the study because of similarities in size, locale, or nature of these participation mechanisms to other cities in the sample, our experience suggested that the rhetoric of citizen participation is somewhat more widespread than its practice.

The thirteen cities selected for field studies were: Atlanta; Boston; Chicago; Columbus, Ohio; Detroit; Duluth, Minnesota; Huntsville, Alabama; Los Angeles; New York; Philadelphia; Rochester, New York; Rockford, Illinois; and San Francisco. Two or more members of the study team spent at least two days observing and inquiring about citizen participation mechanisms in each of these cities. Interviews were conducted with representatives of the school system, citizens involved with the various mechanisms, and knowledgeable observers of local citizen-school system interaction. Relevant documents and reports were obtained and examined in each community. In several cases, one or more members of the study team reside in or near one of these cities and have been following the course of local citizen involvement over time.

The pattern in each city was to identify a number of participatory mechanisms and then focus attention on learning about two or three which appeared most promising. While the team was particularly interested in discovering means of involving poor and minority group citizens in educational decision-making, consideration also was given to participation by other citizen groups. For each mechanism, effort was made to learn: (1) Who participates and whom do they represent? (2) What is the forum for participation? (3) What issues are considered? (4) What tactics are employed by participants? (5) What sanctions are available to participants? (6) What happens? Who responds? How are programs changed? (7) What is the relation of the mechanism to traditional school decision-makers? and (8) How are the strengths and weaknesses of the mechanism perceived by citizen participants, school officials, and informed observers? With regard to the latter point, it is important to note that special efforts were made to talk with persons outside the school hierarchy. Study team members used the above questions as guidelines in preparing case studies about the various mechanisms. These working papers provided the background information for this report.

The study goals were ambitious and the process was hasty. The findings as a result must be considered somewhat tentative and impressionistic. We believe, however, that they offer sufficient basis for some preliminary generalizations about recent developments in citizen participation in school affairs. The following section of this report will present some observations about the workings of the mechanisms studied in each city. Subsequent sections offer recommendations and some concluding thoughts about future directions in citizen participation. The Appendix consists of a brief description of the mechanisms studied in each of the thirteen cities.

Observations Regarding Citizen Participation

Consideration of the mechanisms observed suggests a number of generalizations about citizen participation in school affairs. The record indicates many similarities among developments in the various cities and also points up a number of promising practices. The newness of most of these mechanisms and limitations in our study process, however, dissuade us from labeling our analyses as principles or conclusions about citizen participation. The word "observations" is more realistic and appropriate. Acknowledging that current action can have no better base than current knowledge, what we have noted can perhaps be helpful in that regard while serving also as a stimulus to further inquiry. We have chosen to discuss the purposes of citizen participation, the problems of representativeness, strategies of citizen participation, conditions which facilitate effective participation, dimensions of leadership, school system response to citizen efforts, and roles and functions of third parties. Our purpose is not provide a single prescription for the future of citizen participation but to discuss basic issues related to this process.

The purpose of citizen participation

The mechanisms observed could be categorized in a number of ways. For example, it is possible to distinguish among mechanisms which direct their attention to system-wide, neighborhood, or school building level concerns respectively. Similarly, one can sort out mechanisms which exist outside the sanction of school authorities from those sponsored by the school system. It also is possible to categorize them according to who participates, distinguishing blue-ribbon citizen committees from grass-roots organizations. Mechanisms can be classed too in terms of relatively heterogeneous or homogeneous memberships. Probably none of these variables, however, are as helpful to understanding the nature and operations of particular mechanisms as knowledge about their purposes.

At a very general level, the way in which one defines the purposes of citizen participation depends upon participants' conception of the educational system. If they conceive the educational system to be the province of school officials, citizen participation becomes a tactic of adversaries. To dissident citizens, participation is the means through which they can seize control of the system from the professionals and redirect it to their purposes. To school people with a similar view of the educational system, citizen participation may be viewed as a challenge to administrative control. If this is so, and selected citizens are allowed to participate in specified and limited ways in order to maintain support for the present regime opposition is coopted. It is in this context that the question of community control has become a dramatic issue. The study team, however, found few instances in which citizens wanted to "run" the schools. Interest in influencing school policies and actions is intense and widespread, but not many citizen groups see themselves in the business of actually providing education for children.[5]

There is a second general way to think of the educational system. That is as a system which involves and belongs to the total community. From this perspective, school men neither can nor should be expected to educate children by themselves. Parents, other citizens, and agency personnel have contributions to make to educational outcomes. Citizen participation is the process through which these contributions are made. This framework allows for disagreement, confrontation, and sometimes conflict between citizens and school people but it begins from the premise that all are legitimate participants in the educational enterprise.

Virtually all of the mechanisms observed were established in a context which acknowledged education to be a community responsibility. From this perspective four basic purposes of citizen participation can be identified and the mechanisms which were observed can be associated with them. In several instances, particular mechanisms appeared to serve more than one purpose. Sometimes, one purpose was less explicit than others and, in a few cases, school officials saw a mechanism serving one purpose while citizens valued it for other reasons.

---

[5] The experimental districts in New York City may constitute exceptions to this generalization.

The first purpose of citizen participation which can be noted is to develop community understanding and support for educational objectives. Mario Fantini has stated the rationale for such a purpose well.

> . . . when people have a part in their institutions, they share responsibility for them and are more likely to pay close attention to the stated mission and actual performance of the institution.... Participatory democracy in education should also give parents and community a tangible respect for the intricacy and complexity of the professional problem in urban education. It is not likely that parents who have gained admission as true partners in the process will oversimplify and lay the blame for educational failures solely on the professional.[6]

This purpose may be explained in part as recognition of the need to win public acceptance for educational programs. Its importance transcends the level of popular legitimation for professional efforts and relates to the school success of individual students. Parental attitudes and involvement in school affairs are correlates of student academic success. Involvement in school affairs can help parents understand how to work with the school system in pursuit of common educational objectives for their children. For example, learning that students regularly have homework and are expected to do it or that there is a counselor available to help with career plans can be important. Efforts to develop parental understanding may have direct benefits to children while simultaneously building general public support for educational objectives.

---

[6] Mario D. Fantini, "Alternatives for Urban School Reform." (New York: The Ford Foundation, 1968). p. 14.

Improved community understanding and support for educational objectives has been a traditional objective of Parent-Teacher Associations across the nation. Mechanisms which contribute to this purpose include the several neighborhood and building level advisory committees, the employment of neighborhood residents as nonprofessionals in schools which is done in many cities, and the use of neighborhood workers as liaison persons between the school system and the community.

A second purpose of citizen participation is to supplement school staff members in pursuit of educational objectives. Not all education occurs in schools, but little which takes place outside of schools is coordinated with school programs. The need to remedy this problem is great and one in which citizens can assume leadership. Examples of citizen and/or non-school agency efforts to achieve this purpose include the AHAC program in Huntsville and the Neighborhood Services Project in Detroit. Cooperation with school officials has been central to these programs. Exodus, the Boston community organization, is an example of a neighborhood citizens group which has supplemented school efforts with little contact with the school system. Still another example of a different type is the Chicago Drake/ South Commons School. In that instance, private developers helped provide classroom space and served as a catalyst stimulating efforts to integrate schools in a particular attendance area.

A third purpose of citizen participation is to articulate citizen expectations for schools. Setting educational goals and purposes has long been acknowledged as a lay rather than professional prerogative. Present disagreements center upon the question of which citizens should have formal authority to perform this function at what levels. In exaggerated terms, the choice is presented as one between policy-making by citywide boards of education or neighborhood mini-boards or councils. In practice, however, this is a false issue for very few if any of the emergent citizen mechanisms have been delegated authority to make school policies. In this sense, the mini-board notion has not yet been given a fair trial.

The function of most participatory mechanisms which articulate citizen expectations is not to make school decisions but to put citizens in touch with persons who do. Many of the vehicles observed were quite successful in confronting school officials with citizen views they likely would not learn about otherwise. Once in contact with school officials, citizen representatives employ a variety of informal strategies to influence policy and operating decisions.

Mechanisms for articulating citizen expectations for schools were observed operating with and without the sanction of school systems at city-wide, neighborhood and building levels. Examples of system-wide mechanisms include the Duluth Human Relations Committee, the Citizens Committee on Public Education in Philadelphia, Citizens for Boston Schools, and Responsible Citizens for Quality Education in Rockford. Examples of neighborhood articulators of citizen expectations include the Second Ward Civic League in Atlanta, the King-Timility Joint Advisory Council in Boston, the Area-Wide Committee in Philadelphia, the New York City experimental governing boards, and the Education Issues Coordinating Committee in Los Angeles. Among the building level mechanisms which serve this purpose are the Drake/South Commons School Advisory Board in Chicago, the Ad Hoc Pickett Committee in Philadelphia, and the Washington Community School Advisory Board in Rockford.

A fourth purpose of citizen participation mechanisms is to insist upon accountability for educational objectives. This is an extremely complicated matter but one of increasing concern to urban residents. "If the children aren't learning, the teachers aren't teaching" is a popular, albeit over-simplified, theme among some citizens. However, there can be no gain-saying the right of the public to know how the educational system is performing. Moreover, if citizens are helped to understand that they are a part of that system, the results of any assessment may point to areas for increased lay as well as professional effort.

Citizen concern for accountability is being expressed in many ways. One of the first actions of the Citizens Committee on Public Education in Philadelphia was to work for procedures to select board of education members which would make the board more accountable to the public. The Pupil Placement Committee in Rockford wanted to know if students in different but presumably equal schools achieved at different levels. Student unrest in a Detroit high school led to formation of a city-wide commission and a number of neighborhood citizen committees to study the total program in all city high schools. The Ad Hoc Pickett Committee in Philadelphia asked for and received permission to participate in the formulation and application of criteria to evaluate the school principal. Ocean Hill-Brownsville Governing Board members have assumed the right to dismiss teachers whom they deem ineffective.

Accountability as sought in these instances appears to have two dimensions. The first is access to information about performance. The second is ability to change those factors thought to be responsible for unsatisfactory performance. Like mechanisms established to articulate citizen expectations, those which attempt to maintain accountability have little if any authority to alter conditions. Many of them have considerable power in this regard however.[8] The facts seem to be that some citizen participation mechanisms have resources which they can employ in such a way that formal school authorities yield to their requests to change factors which the citizens consider responsible for unsatisfactory performance. Instances were identified, for example, where school officials removed or transferred a teacher or principal because of citizen dissatisfaction.

Four basic purposes of citizen participation in school affairs have been noted. They are to develop community understanding and support for educational objectives, to supplement school staff members in pursuit of educational objectives, to articulate citizen expectations for schools, and to insist upon accountability for educational objectives. The last two of these are the most controversial and threatening to established decision-making procedures. Because this is the case most of the observations in the following pages will focus upon participatory mechanisms and processes which set forth expectations and call for accountability.

---

[8] Some definitions are in order here. We use "authority" to mean the accepted right to act. We define "power" as the ability to cause a change in behavior.

The problem of respresentativeness

The question of representativeness is persistent in the case of participation mechanisms which exist to clarify citizen expectations for schools or to insist upon accountability in some form. This is particularly true of so-called mini-boards, advisory councils, or similar bodies which have been established at school building or neighborhood levels. The rationale for such mechanisms is that individuals familiar with neighborhood needs and concerns on a first-hand basis are in better position to direct and assess local school performance than city board of education members. In effect, the argument is that, from the perspective of dealing with local concerns, citizens are more likely to represent the true views of the people being served than officials who are responsible for a broader jurisdiction.

The point so frequently at issue is one of clarifying who it is that participants in these mechanisms actually represent. The concept of representation is an elusive one. The obligations of a representative, for example, have been the subject of much speculation by political theorists. Is the responsibility of a representative to act as the majority of his constituents would act, or is it to act as he deems best given his own conscience and perception of particular situations? The question is as real for citizens who are active in school affairs as it is for congressmen and other government representatives.

Two conditions central to the practice of representative government are that (1) the range of issues be defined upon which representatives can act, and (2) representatives are accountable to the party who places them in office. People give their representatives authority to enact policies which will affect them in the knowledge that these representatives will act within the framework of particular bylaws or constitutional provisions. Likewise, they know that they will have regular opportunities to decide whether the actions of their representatives warrant continued tenure in office or if they should be replaced. Such is the position of local board of education members. Their authority is derived from statutes and they must stand for popular election or appointment by a responsible public official.

The sources of authority which legitimate judgments by members of citizen advisory committees are by no means as clear as those for board of education members. An important reason is that the responsibilities for those who are a part of such mechanisms have not been defined clearly in the public mind. Unlike the Congress, state legislatures, or boards of education, citizen participation mechanisms with advisory or assessment responsibilities lack an established tradition. Few people are certain about what these vehicles should do, or equally as important, how established authorities (i.e., school administrators and board of education members) should respond to them.

School board members mindful of their responsibility to a broader electorate hesitate to relinquish prerogatives to groups with more parochial interests; citizens disenchanted with traditional school system behavior expect these new mechanisms to achieve dramatic changes immediately; and the new citizen representatives, mindful of the cross-pressures upon them, are without direction.

Because their authority to act upon particular matters has not been clearly established in many instances, the boundaries of authority vested in citizen groups are tested frequently both by some school officials who would restrict citizen capacity to initiate change and by certain community residents who see citizen participation as a means to destroy schools as we now know them. Inasmuch as their legitimacy to make or influence any decisions at all rests upon the claim that they are representative of the neighborhood or school attendance area affected by decisions, members of citizen participation mechanisms are faced with a continuing need to demonstrate this representativeness to both school officials and the public.

A variety of means was found for forming citizen groups interested in school affairs ranging from appointment by a building principal or the board of education to election by parents to the self-selection techniques of neighborhood activists. None of these procedures in themselves resulted in the identification of persons whom all parties involved considered to be representative. Citizen representatives are in the difficult position of having to build support among two groups who, in some instances, are uninformed and/or distrustful of each other.

Most citizen participation mechanisms lack authority to enact binding policy decisions.[9] If they are to be effective articulators of citizen demands or agents of accountability, these bodies must convince school officials to act in ways they otherwise would not. In other words, they must be able to influence the established decision-making process. The likelihood of success in this endeavor frequently hinges upon ability to convince school officials that the views which they express are, in fact, representative of the people to be affected by the decision at issue.[10] Even when they have appointed the representatives themselves or established the procedures for selecting them, school officials sometimes reject the recommendations of citizen groups on the premise that they are not representative.

---

[9] Some important exceptions to this generalization were noted such as the provision in the San Francisco SEED program which allows parent review groups and the program governing board to designate how $20,000 in discretionary funds will be spent annually.

[10] One superintendent reported that when groups come before him with demands which they say represent the views of one particular neighborhood, he sometimes sends postcards to residents in order to verify their assertion.

Indices of representativeness which were found to be meaningful among school officials include diversity of institutional affiliations within the citizen group membership and community solidarity. In appointing citizen groups or reacting to groups formed outside the system, school officials demonstrated a tendency to favor bodies which include persons affiliated with the range of voluntary organizations and social and educative agencies in the neighborhood to be served. Solidarity appears to be headed by school officials. Solidarity is manifest in at least two important ways. The first is by a lack of "noise" or competing claims from other dissident groups in the community; the second is by open expressions of support (ranging from informal comments by community residents to keeping children home from school or marching on picket lines) for the positions taken by citizen groups.

Citizen groups who enjoy clear community support are at an advantage to "less representative" groups in negotiating with school officials. A related and important observation is that the response of school officials to the concerns of citizen groups influences the solidarity of these groups. Denial of all requests or demands emanating from the community serves as a catalyst bringing all concerned citizens together in opposition to the establishment. On the other hand, acquiescence to the demands of a group which has some public following is likely to enhance its following and, hence, the image of "representativeness" of that group in contrast to others which may be competing for favor.

While citizen groups seek recognition from established authorities in the decision-making process, they must work simultaneously to assure that the persons for whom they presume to speak regard them as their representatives. It is not uncommon for these individuals to face neighborhood challenges to their representativeness particularly if they come from an area in which there is a history of school-community animosity. School system antagonists will charge that representatives to participatory mechanisms are pawns of the school system who have no real power but merely endorse decisions made by school officials. The fact that many advisory bodies are appointed by school officials or selected through a procedure designated by them often makes them suspect from the outset. In the absence of formal means to replace citizen representatives, dissident groups often seek to discredit them.

To establish and maintain community reputations, individuals often must demonstrate their willingness to oppose school officials on particular points. Moreover, they must show ability to deliver results on matters of community concern especially if they have made statements or promises to this effect. This need is a recurring one in some locales for would-be community leaders are numerous and the public memory is sometimes short. "What have you done for us lately?" is not an unfamiliar question to citizens who attempt to represent their neighbors in dealing with school officials.

His need to maintain representativeness in his own community requires an individual to have continuing contact with his neighbors. He must be knowledgeable about community concerns and able to convince citizens that he can do something about them. The same representative is more than an articulator and negotiator for community matters; he helps shape those concerns at the neighorhood level. Few people in the community better understand what the schools are doing or are better able to see possibilities for changing the school program than the citizen representative with access to school officials. The successful (in the sense that he moves the school system and maintains respect in his community) community participant uses this knowledge base to help residents (1) improve their understanding of the school program, and (2) spell out realistic demands for changing that program.

In summary, citizen participants who wish to maintain their representativeness must be "politicians" who help shape realistic community demands on which they have a chance to deliver and simultaneously build the community solidarity necessary to persuade school officials to act. This role is very difficult; at the present time few individuals have it mastered. As a consequence, the question of representativeness persists and plagues citizen participation mechanisms.

Citizen participation strategies

It is important to consider both the strategies employed by school officials relative to citizen participation and those of citizens who participate. Three basic strategies of schoolmen were identified. For shorthand purposes, they can be referred to as paternalistic, supportive, and change-oriented.

The traditional professional view toward citizen participation has been one of paternalism. For example, the history of most local parent-teacher organizations has reflected a pattern of administrator dominance in which parents consider only those matters school people put before them. This situation clearly is changing as more administrators come to welcome citizen interest in school matters of their own choosing. Yet the view prevails among many school people that school affairs are too important to be subjected to the partisanship and conflict that often characterize citizen involvement. They believe decisions about schools should be based only upon professional judgments and interpretations.

School officials have adopted several means to assure that new forms of citizen participation do not challenge the ideals of orderliness and expertise too forcefully. Administrators often have placed some of their most extreme critics on newlycreated advisory boards or other bodies. While the rationale for such action usually is to improve understanding of what the critics are saying, a frequent parallel purpose is to reduce the "noise level" by bringing opponents inside the system.

Provisions for administrative veto power and budget control in the bylaws of advisory bodies can be interpreted as evidence of paternalism. Perhaps a more useful view is to consider such provisions part of a check and balance structure and to base judgments regarding paternalistic tendencies upon the way in which this structure is used.

One other means of control employed by paternalistic administrators deserves mention. Administrators have an enormous advantage, if they are inclined to dominate citizen groups, through their knowledge about education and the workings of the school system and, in many cases, their ability to control the information which comes out of the system. Indeed, even when they do not willfully plan such dominance, it sometimes develops naturally when they meet with citizen groups.

A second administrative strategy relative to citizen participation is to support citizens in efforts to bring latent grievances and antagonisms into the open where they can be managed. Such grievances probably have been entrenched in minority communities for a long time and have not reached school officials in the proportions to which they exist. One plausible theory about contemporary urban society is that such frustrations must be acknowledged and responded to by appropriate authorities. If not, those who have them may resort to severe disruption of the established order.

Some school systems have employed individuals to go into minority communities and teach the residents how to bring their anxieties and frustrations about school matters to the attention of formal school authorities. These community workers attempt to become indigenous to the neighborhood in which they work and do what is necessary to gain and retain confidence of the community. Community workers sometimes have been advised by school officials that if circumstances should arise where they are forced to choose between siding with the school system or siding with the community, they should side with the community. Perhaps the best way to describe the function of such persons is that of advising community residents about how to petition and work with the school system. Activities in this arena go beyond securing information and advising people about who to call. Community workers often serve as community organizers on the rationale that when a community has developed its own educational structures, it can express its needs and expectations to the schools. The impact of these efforts has been to create more rather than less community demands for school officials to satisfy. By developing community ability to mobilize demands, school officials have contributed to the demise of paternalistic styles within their own systems. At the same time they have opened new opportunities to improve relationships with minority communities.

A third administrative strategy emphasizes citizen participation as a means to change. It is something of a cross between the two already discussed. In some of the cases observed by members of the study team, school officials recognized a need for a particular change in the school program but acknowledged that opposition to this was present either somewhere in the school hierarchy or among segments of the public at large. (Sometimes the condition was not so much opposition to such a change as it was lack of support for it.) The administrative strategy in these instances has been to support the requests of a citizens group for such a change as a means of countervailing other conservative pressures. In some instances a program need recognized by school officials first gained public attention as the request or demand of a citizen group. Interestingly, this strategy is employed sometimes by central office administrators and school board members who would like to see changes made by building principals; it also is used by principals seeking changes at the school system level.

Citizens also employ a variety of strategies for dealing with school officials. For shorthand purposes, we can refer to formal, informal and public confrontation strategies. These various strategies are often linked. For example, citizens who fail in an effort to convince board of education members on an informal basis may band together to employ formal election procedures to remove them from office. Similarly citizens who fail to win official support for their position through quiet discussion may seek a public confrontation as a means of appealing for the support of others. In such an instance their goal is either to attract enough votes to their cause to elect new board of education members (an extreme example) or to win support from someone sufficiently influential with school officials that he can and will persuade them to acquiesce to the protestors. Ways of taking issues to the public range from holding forums and publishing newsletters to creating dramatic instances of conflict in the hope that they will be reported widely by the popular media.

Citizens generally will employ these same strategies whether or not their participatory mechanisms have been established or sanctioned by school officials. Formal tactics available to outsiders, for example, include voting, writing letters, or making formal appearances before the board of education. Members of a school system-sanctioned advisory board have the same opportunities as well as that of making recommendations about certain matters. Assuming that these tactics are unsuccessful, a likely corollary step will be an informal attempt to persuade school officials. It is at this point that the value or importance of citizen participation mechanisms becomes apparent. Their significance is not that they give broad formal controls to lay citizens, but that they provide citizen representatives with ready access to school authorities.

Citizen representatives have a number of negotiating tactics which they can use to influence policy-making given access to school authorities. Not least among these is to be persuasive about the rationality of their proposals. Convincing officials of their representativeness is also helpful as noted earlier. Citizens are not without effective sanctions either. The ultimate sanction available in most of the cities observed by the study team was withdrawal or refusal to participate. Such action or the threat of it is often effective for two reasons. First, it upsets the orderly and conflict-free relationships which school people have defined as exemplifying the ideal school-community setting. They generally would like to avoid the public unrest that might accompany an announcement that citizens who once were "part of the team" had resigned. Second, refusal of citizens to endorse certain programs could jeopardize under some circumstances, the continuation of the government or foundation funds supporting them. Many programs have been established with state, federal or foundation funds on the condition that citizens participate in them. Some community leaders are forthright in stating their belief that school officials are reluctant to test the possibility that these funds would be discontinued if citizens withdrew their endorsements.

Still another tactic employed by citizens to influence school officials is the threat of community violence or disruption. The point is made realistically by relatively moderate community leaders that refusal to meet their requests will enable more radical individuals to achieve leadership status in the neighborhood. Negotiations with these people, the moderates add, would be far more difficult. A variation of the same tactic is to assert that unless certain conditions are changed, citizen leaders will be unable to control the frustrations of community militants who might resort to violence. The tensions in some communities in concert with the anti-conflict norms prominent among schoolmen have made this an effective tactic.

To withdraw citizen participation in fact or to take to the streets in protest is to activate the third stage of citizen strategy. The effect is to raise what has been a relatively narrow set of concerns to a new level of public consciousness. The cases of established authorities and dissatisfied citizens are placed before the public to judge in the hope that new parties to the dispute will enter in such a way that resolutions will be forthcoming.

It is clear that citizen leaders sometimes take an issue into the open not because they cannot achieve results without fanfare by negotiating quietly with authorities but because they sense the need to build solidarity for their own position as citizen representatives. To go before one's neighbors and identify the school system as the "bad guy" on an issue of concern to residents seems to be an effective tactic for uniting the community behind the leaders who carry the fight. If "concessions" can be won from school authorities, the stature of these leaders is enhanced further. It should be recognized that community leaders must occasionally create such an issue if they are to remain effective in their own neighborhood.

Citizen effectiveness

The question has been asked if citizens, particularly those whose own education and previous contact with the schools has been limited, can participate effectively in school decision-making. If change in student behavior and achievement are posed as the effectiveness criteria, the answer must be that we do not know. The logic of citizen participation as a strategy for improving school performance is compelling to many persons. Careful research, however, is badly needed to determine the impact of various modes of citizen participation upon educational outcomes. Until the results of such studies are available, important questions about the ultimate benefits of citizen participation will remain unanswered.

There are other criteria of effectiveness about which the observations of the study team provided at least some impressionistic evidence. Citizens in many cities stated the belief that their schools had become more responsive to the public since participation was expanded. Citizens and school people alike commented that the presence of participation mechanisms had enhanced public support for the school and reduced school-community tensions. In short, the process of participation itself seems to produce some benefits notwithstanding other substantive returns which may accrue to students.

Another way to ask the effectiveness question is to inquire whether or not citizen participation mechanisms contribute to any changes in school programs or operating procedures. As the descriptions earlier in the report indicated, most of the citizen mechanisms which were observed brought about some changes. Some vehicles, however, were more effective than others from this standpoint.

Several conditions which facilitate citizen-sponsored changes were noted. For example, staff assistance can be very helpful to citizen advisory groups. It is hardly more reasonable to expect lay advisory committees to develop carefully-formulated recommendations without staff help than it is to expect boards of education to function without assistance. The staff person for a citizens group need not be a professional school person although he should have access to school information. In addition, the work of such a group may be more inventive and neighborhood-oriented if the staff person on whom they rely is not the administrative head of the unit to which they are advisory (e.g., the principal as the staff person for a building level advisory committee). University personnel, for example, have served capably as assistants to community groups.

Citizen groups would seem to be more effective when they have opportunities to learn about the domain in which they are to work. Few citizens who become members of such groups have much knowledge about how school systems work or how they can be changed. Probably even fewer have much substantive knowledge about compensatory education or other matters about which they may wish to advise. Indeed, some citizens also lack understanding of the community they are *supposed to represent*. Again, as with new board of education members, the study team learned that other citizens can overcome these temporary handicaps and become articulate and knowledgeable change advocates. Steps which assist in this process include allowing the same advisory board members to to serve over a period of time (one year terms are not sufficient) and providing them with reading materials and sometimes instruction. Instruction would seem to be most helpful and acceptable to citizens when provided by someone other than the head of the unit whom they advise. Summer workshops or other sessions run by university personnel or persons from the community relations department of the school system have been useful in this regard.

A third condition which contributes to the effectiveness of citizen participation mechanisms is clarity about the functions and expectations for such a body. Citizens who participate in mechanisms which have their scope of authority clearly delineated are aided in focusing their attention upon realistic problems and objectives. Perhaps equally as important, they are helped in defending their right to represent the community from aggressive individuals who charge them with not acting forcefully enough vis-a-vis school officials.

The forms of participation reported by the study team indicate the importance of ready access and appeal processes for citizen groups to top echelon school officials. It is not unusual for administrators at neighborhood or building levels to perceive citizen advisory bodies at their levels as threatening to their prerogatives. More than a few worthwhile proposals from citizen groups have been dismissed by overly defensive administrators in lower level positions. School-community relationships have suffered severely in some of these instances. Ready access of citizens to officials who take a broader view of events in the school system often can avert such situations. By the same token, the knowledge that citizens can appeal to external sanctioning bodies such as the federal government or foundation officials for support has augmented the effectiveness of many groups.

Dimensions of leadership

Participation implies participants--people. The new forms of participation reveal once again the obvious: success is dependent upon human capacity. It makes little difference whether the form of participation is one that school systems design and establish or is one that poor, black indigenous leaders put together to achieve their educational reform objectives. The ends sought--changes in educational structure, policy or whatever--are tied to the "people problem." The capacities of individual participants and the properties of groups are in the final analysis what make the difference.

In general the commitment among laymen to the purposes and values of citizen participation appears to be strong. The motivations of people to participate, although at times personal and selfish, are for the most part wholesome. And despite the fact that today's participants are drawn from all sectors of modern society there is common belief that schools and educational outcomes can be improved. Why then is it so agonizingly difficult to make headway, to get the job done? Why can't groups achieve what everyone wants--citizen and schoolman alike? Why is everyone working so hard? Why are gains so often tentative and shortlived? What are the factors that impinge upon the citizen participatory act that tend to limit its effectiveness? Who is the enemy?

There are several personal factors essential to successful participation. The first of these is time. One must always keep in mind that the participation of laymen is at best a part-time activity. This is especially true for lower class male participants (except for unemployed) who must earn a living. Housewives too must endure large scale inconveniences to take part; they steal time from running a household, child bearing, child rearing, measles and mumps, jobs, and other activities in order to work for school improvements. Participants find it extraordinarily difficult to carve enough time out of their lives to engage productively in citizen affairs. The price of participation is inconvenience, hard work, sometimes sneers and jeers, and other forms of disapproval plus the expenditure of time, large amounts of time.

A second factor is simply _perseverance_. Participation, by definition, calls for involvement. Each encounter causes persons to speculate about the intent, hopes, beliefs, attitudes, and commitments of other participants. "Dialogue" is a time consuming activity. It is made more complex as the heterogeneity of the participants increases. In those participation mechanisms, where a wide range of inputs are sought and incorporated, the pace of conversation is slow. It requires tenacity to pursue discussions in the face of large scale impediments. At the same time that heterogeneous inputs slow deliberative and reflective processes, they allow for intermingling of perspectives and points of view. It is from this sort of mix that genuine progress is generated. Perseverance is essential to success. It must be cautioned, however, that perseverance is no substitute for results. Citizens who are faithful in attending meetings over a period of time expect to see something happen as a consequence. If action does not develop, their faith in due process is undermined, and their susceptibility to the influence of revolutionaries is increased.

A third factor is understanding. Understanding is related to patience. There is need for all parties to take stock of the group context in which conversation develops. Any expectation that decisions will emerge quickly and efficiently is inappropriately held. In social circumstances where the mix of inputs is varied, it is not logical to expect the achievement of quick and dramatic consensus. There are language barriers, social barriers, personality variations, intellectual differences, and different stakes involved. Participants mature over time and come to appreciate and value the setting in which dialogue goes forward. At the outset, however, there are tendencies for people to withdraw because of frustrations with group development and little or no progress. Leaders in such settings must work carefully to retain interest and to achieve a sense of forward motion even when progress is modest. They must themselves possess understanding--of group properties, of participatory roles, of adequate achievement, and the like.

The fourth factor is leadership. Trite as it is to state, the principal ingredient in successful participation is leadership. Within each mode of participation described in the thirteen cities, there is a key individual or small cluster of persons who has provided the thrust or momentum. There is no denying the fact that the commitments of such individuals, linked with their capacity to lead, account for most of the progress toward change and improved educational policy. City by city, mechanism by mechanism, the role of leadership stands out as the basic force in movement ahead. There always has been one man, one woman, one interested nucleus group, one dedicated professional, one parent, one taxpayer, one public official, one black militant who energizes a sequence of activities leading to change. Improvements do not just happen. They are the products of intense expenditures of energy, time, and sacrifice.

Demand for the services of the small number of visible leaders in American cities is escalating rapidly. Fewer and fewer people are being asked to do more and more things of a public service nature. Within several of the cities studied (Detroit, Duluth, Huntsville, Atlanta) blue ribbon or elite groups have been formed to effect educational change. The composition of these groups includes persons also serving in many other public sectors. There is an explicit advantage in such participation because it provides a ready-made knitting of traditionally powerful public interests. At the same time, however, communities are calling upon tired, overworked, and sometimes unimaginative people. The numbers and the quality of leadership people at the top echelons must be extended. There must be deliberate, explicit structures for leadership development in American cities. We cannot rely upon "natural" development processes to provide an adequate supply.

Moving to the other extreme of the social and economic continuum, there appears to be a reservoir of potential leadership talent within the most disadvantaged segments of society. Within the several cities that were visited, there are able and deeply committed poor people (black and white) who can lead. At the same time, there is a distinct need to provide leadership training for some of these persons.

The observation is made repeatedly that within lower class indigenous populations an intense struggle for power is underway. People are vying for recognition as well as the economic rewards attendant to leadership posts. Community action programs, Head Start, the Model Cities program and other New Frontier and Great Society efforts have offered indigenous leaders new opportunities. Such opportunities are sometimes in the form of employment. Others offer status rewards essentially; both are sought after by people from lower socioeconomic circumstances.

Some persons believe that such leadership competitiveness is dysfunctional to public interests particularly of the kind we are describing. Our perspective, however, is to the contrary. We believe that out of environments which appear to be chaotic, unstructured, and open, new leadership strengths will emerge. The competitive milieu itself is healthy. We must develop tolerance of behaviors which on initial inspection appear to be obstructionist, delaying, anarchic, often unpleasant, and emotional. People who choose to participate from all sectors of society must become comfortable with confrontation. Successful leaders ultimately will be those who understand the nature of competitive leadership conditions, develop capacities to exploit those conditions, and possess the patience to endure periods of ambiguity and uncertainty.

It is clear too that several kinds of leaders are necessary. The "militant" for example performs a critical function in the change process.[11] So does the moderate. The militant has the capacity to hit and run, to upset the serenity of maintenance-oriented school personnel. He can ask hard questions, embarrass, intimidate, frighten, and create large scale unrest. The militant does what many moderates would like to do, what moderates lack the courage to do. The militant opens up situations and lays issues on the table. The moderate can then move in, capitalize on openness, and consolidate gains. Most militants are laymen but there are a few in the schools. There should be more. It is difficult for school people to avoid educational issues if they are exposed by their colleagues.

---

[11] The word militant has become a badly twisted, derogatory label. As we use it here, we do not mean a man with a torch in his hand. We mean a man who is willing to take risks and step out of the conventional modes of achieving social and political goals.

These times call for new patterns of leadership on the part of the school people. The superintendent of schools, the principal, the classroom teacher, the board of education member --each has his own opportunity to support or inhibit participation of laymen. Our review of new mechanisms revealed several postures toward lay participation on the part of school personnel. We noted the principal who behaved as a politician. We saw him working with unusual effectiveness in exploiting every opportunity for citizen involvement. We also noted the capacity of some superintendents to stir up and exploit citizen demand for educational improvement. These administrators were converting citizen interest into positive support for educational change. On other occasions we saw defensiveness, subtle resistance, unwillingness, and outright attempts to block citizen efforts to take part in school affairs. Even where resistance was evident people in the schools as well as the community often seemed to hold the same general hopes and aspirations for citizen participation. Nevertheless, the behavior of school personnel did not always seem commensurate with those goals.

School system response

The problems in school-community relationships mystify many school administrators, teachers and board members. They feel that they have dedicated their lives to the achievement of public school purposes. They have worked doggedly at establishing what they believe to be good approaches to school and community understanding. Now many of them sense that they are being vilified for failing at one of the tasks upon which they have worked the hardest. As a consequence some have become despondent, embittered, and disenchanted. Such school people cannot understand why they are not understood. They ask: what has happened that has caused many of the friends of the schools and school officials to turn suddenly on them--often with a vengeance? Where have school people dropped the ball? What has gone wrong?

Part of the problem stems from a basic fallacy in school system approaches to school public relations. The preparation programs for school administrators have emphasized an "information giving" philosophy. School administrators in training have been urged to: tell people about your schools; bring parents into your schools; sell your schools to the people. Very few efforts of a continuing type have been mounted which allow parents and students opportunities to share their feelings about the schools with school officials. Information flow has been primarily one way. Legitimate outlets have not been provided for protest or discontent. PTA's and similar organizations have ruled out of bounds discussions of local school weaknesses in order to perpetuate an atmosphere of peace, tranquility and all is well. As a consequence, school systems have not had safety valves. There are no designed schemes for absorbing or dealing with pressure, no organized way of facing dissatisfaction. The emphasis has been on "how well we are doing" as reported and defined only by school people. Organizations like PTA's have been co-opted too often by school officials. PTA's have paid a high price for being loved by school personnel.

Inability to deal with discontent has caused school people to withdraw, isolate themselves from their constituencies (even their students), and communicate an intensely defensive posture. The tragic part of this phenomenon is that no one really wills that it be this way. Such institutional withdrawal and protectionist behavior is simply the natural response of an organism that has failed to locate an adequate coping capacity.

Evidence of hostility between communities and schools is present at all levels. The classroom teacher is frequently fearful of encounters with parents, even students. Many are uncomfortable in such relationships. They have difficulty explaining what they are doing, reporting on the progress of individual children, or communicating effectively with laymen for whom professional jargon is just so much balderdash. Discussions are frequently formal, uncomfortable, and unproductive. Large numbers of parents leave encounters with teachers and principals confused, even dismayed. The cumulative effect is parent disquiet and disenchantment.

Principals, although there is wide variation among them, often have difficulty relating their schools to their constituencies. They, like their teachers, often find it awkward to conduct conversations with parents, students, and community leaders about their schools. Well-intentioned inquiries about school rules and regulations, for example, often are perceived as threatening. Some principals appear to feel that such regulations are their preserve and responsibility. Outsiders are not to infringe upon that domain. Other principals are obviously uncertain about the bases upon which rules and regulations are drawn, find them difficult to defend, and hence seek to avoid discussions of them. Still others who recognize the fragile foundation upon which building level governance is based seek to avoid the nightmare of that exposure. They find it difficult to conceptualize a means through which a thorough examination and evaluation of building level management can go forward.

The learned response of many school officials to criticism or to the identification of weaknesses has been the recitation of successes. The successes of the schools have been large scale indeed. No other nation has developed a system of schools that seriously challenges our own. But the reiteration of virtues hardly satisfies the mother of a child who is not learning to read or the high school senior who has been dismissed because he has long hair.

Superintendents too have found difficulty in coping with the new citizen surge. We did find, however, a number of refreshing examples of openness on the part of school superintendents. There is general recognition among many superintendents of the seriousness of the matter as well as an understanding of many of the problems in achieving school and community compatability. School superintendents are exposed and vulnerable. They are bombarded continuously with public feeling about schools. They probably are apprised more fully of the variety and intensity of reaction to the schools than any other officials. They too find it uncomfortable to defend school practices for which there are only weak or incomplete rationales.

School superintendents and principals are trying hard to develop their capacities to listen. Some have learned that it is wise to be available to individuals and groups who want to report their feelings and impressions of the schools to them. The availability of school officials helps reduce anxiety and tension but it by no means solves problems. Indeed, availability followed by little or no action may escalate dissatisfaction rather than reduce it. Thus administrators who decide to open themselves and their school systems to community thinking and ideas must be prepared to act upon what they learn.

School boards are being subjected to waves of citizen interest too. They, by definition, are the delegates of the public charged with the responsibility of identifying the need for education, interpreting demand, securing the resources and appraising the accomplishments of the system. School board members are responsible legally for the effectiveness of the school. Thus it is at the board level that the most far-reaching decisions must be effected.

Citizens can have fundamental impact on school policy through participation in the selection of members to boards of education. Beyond this formal process, other political means must be sought to influence board member action. As noted earlier, citizens have employed an expanding number of techniques to communicate their wishes. The boycott has been one of the most effective devices in their repertoire. Boycotts dramatize the seriousness of parental feeling. They attract the mass media. They usually elicit some kind of response--either hostility which leads to fresh confrontations or recognition of basic problems and new efforts to achieve solutions.

The demonstration (marches on board meetings, packing the galleries, picketing of schools or boards of education) is exciting but does not wear well. The first demonstration often is rather exhilarating for everybody although a bit disruptive and confusing, but board members and school officials soon develop a remarkable capacity to ignore demonstrators. Threats, invectives, poison pen letters, nasty phone calls and the like have little or no effect.

Boards like professional school personnel must perfect a capacity to listen; they must learn to sort out irresponsible and crack pot blasts from genuine, heart felt appeals for reform. Furthermore, they, like their employees, must not only listen and understand, they must respond.

Third party roles and functions

Schools do not always relate directly to their clientele (i.e., teacher to parent, principal to family, superintendent to community organizations). Some promising new mechanisms perform intermediary functions which in some cases are rather specialized. They differ from traditional mechanisms (school district advisory committees or symbiotic groups like the PTA) in significant ways. The most crucial difference is that they are not captives of the schools; they can preserve their autonomy and independence. Freedom is crucial to the performance of third party functions as the examples which follow illustrate.

The ombudsman is one important example of the third party role. It is a special opportunity for the citizen to relate to schools in a personalized and intimate fashion about problems of critical importance to him. Another could be labeled linkage groups; the Woodlawn Community Board in Chicago is an alliance among the Woodlawn Organization, the Chicago public schools, and the University of Chicago. More massive involvements form another type such as the large committees found in several of the cities, the Urban Education Coalition in Columbus, Ohio, and the New Detroit Committee. Still another highly specialized example is the third party arbitrator. Each of these is also a special example of how schools can profit from citizen interest. They represent legitimate opportunities for school people to help shape citizen relationships and at the same time avoid the fact and the charge that they are controlling them.

The ombudsman concept is being explored these days in a number of contexts most of which are outside of education. Interest in the citizen defender notion is in fact world wide. The ombudsman function, that of an orderly procedure for remedying citizen grievance, is needed in public education. Sound ideas about how it can be achieved are lacking however. The most promising experiment with the ombudsman that we discovered was in Rockford, Illinois. The responsibility of the ombudsman there is that of liaison and mediator between the community and a junior high school. The ombudsman and his two assistants are paid by the school system but are responsible to a local advisory board and the community at large.

School systems, in our judgment, would profit from an extended examination of how the ombudsman idea can be incorporated in school organization. Review of the ombudsman function ought to be going on in many cities and should include parents, non-parents, students, teachers and other school personnel. The Rockford plan limits the ombudsman's responsibilities to the building level essentially. Other systems might well be trying the notion on a district wide basis.

Opponents of the ombudsman argue that adequate grievance machinery already exists within organizations. In the case of schools they maintain that the board of education is itself a grievance body. Personnel such as human relations directors also fulfill this need. The facts are that urban school systems are not usually meeting this need and have not yet discovered ways to respond effectively to citizen grievances. Experimentation is in order.

Mechanisms which provide new linkages among existing institutions are extraordinarily promising. Alliances between school systems, universities, foundations, businesses and community agencies should be extended. They provide for open flow of ideas, resources and feelings among special partners in educational change. The Association of Huntsville Area Companies is an exciting example of business initiative being translated into educational improvement through relationships among business, school systems and institutions of higher education. The Education Committee of the Area-Wide Council in Philadelphia is linked to the school system and Temple University. The King-Timility Joint Advisory Council in Boston, the Woodlawn Community Board, the Drake/South Commons School in Chicago, the Neighborhood Services Program and the New Detroit Committee in Detroit, and the Duluth Schools Human Relations Committee are other examples of powerful and productive inter-institutional ties.

Massive approaches fill a unique need for participation which other mechanisms cannot fulfill. They allow for heterogeneous representation as well as geographical spread. Similarly their basis for problem analysis and issue confrontation is extensive. Actions of such groups carry with them considerable legitimation and political significance at least for city-wide problems. One ambitious new example of the large scale involvement approach is the Urban Education Coalition formed in Columbus, Ohio.

In today's school affairs, with more and more people aware of the significance of education, there are pressures within situations which lead to polarization of points of view. Often such differences become exaggerated or so advanced that the schools split sharply from their communities. For example, parents in several communities have organized against their neighborhood school principal or against a teacher or teachers. Efforts to bring the parents and the school officials together on issues often have failed. In other cases local communities have had deep differences with central school authorities including their boards of education such as has occurred in the Ocean Hill-Brownsville controversy in New York City. Several efforts to bring the Ocean Hill-Brownsville community and the New York City school officials into productive problem solving conversations failed.

When serious deterioration in relationships occur, when the emotions of parents, students, teachers, administrators, school board members or any other interested party are so aroused that capacity for reason has been destroyed, when there are no longer opportunities for purposeful conversations, then there is the need for a "third party" mechanism which will help the participants move past the point of impasse. Many of the elements of collective bargaining are present in such situations; likewise, the strategies and techniques of bargaining are appropriate for resolving community-school breakdown.

The absence of definitive third party arbitration designs does not suggest that attention to them is unwarranted. The prospects for an increase in school-community tension, flare-ups, controversy, anxiety are here. The instances of parental and/or citizen reaction against a neighborhood school administrator or teacher or a group of teachers or both probably will grow in number. The prospect of neighborhood groups or area representatives registering protest against central school authorities is likely to increase. Although the incidence of such protests has been higher in the large cities to date, it will undoubtedly occur more frequently in suburbs and small towns in the future.

In our judgment breakdown or threatened breakdown in discussions between or among interested parties in educational matters, regardless of the substance of the differences, calls for an arbitration vehicle. When a parent group registers protest with a neighborhood principal and efforts at solution fail, a third party should be engaged to reconcile differences, settle the matters at dispute, and move the discussion toward a genuine solution to the problem. There are many potential hang-ups in value-laden and emotion-packed settings. Dealing with hang-ups and moving groups toward problem solving requires skillful leadership.

The Columbus Urban Education Coalition task force on school-community understanding has as one of its principal objectives the refinement of appropriate third party mechanisms. It is searching for appropriate vehicles for arbitration of school community controversies. It may be necessary to locate people with skills in arbitration and train them further for such responsibilities. If communities were to identify potential arbitrators, offer them some kind of modest preparation, and have them available, serious and unwholesome deteriorations might be avoided.

Summation

We have in this section of the report shared our observations regarding citizen participation. Specifically we have dealt with the purposes of citizen participation, the problem of representativeness, citizen participation strategies, citizen participation effectiveness, the participants themselves, school system responses and third party roles.

In what the task force members found and reported as well as in our analysis, there are direct and implied criticisms of schools, school boards, and school personnel. One could conclude that everthing is terribly bleak, perhaps even hopeless, because school people and citizens just are not going to join forces. Such a conclusion would be unfortunate and, indeed, unwarranted.

We found exciting, productive mechanisms functioning in all of the cities. But there needs to be many more in cities everywhere. At least two examples from each are described briefly in this document. Where mechanisms are working well school people and citizens are joining hands, pondering problems together, and hammering out solutions. Leadership is emerging within the schools as well as in the community. School officials and citizens expressed satisfaction with results as well as belief in the promise of the future. We are optimistic that this will be the case.

Recommendations

The recommendations presented in this section grow out of the observations by the study team in the thirteen cities which were visited. They are predicated on the assumption that citizen pressure for an expanded role in school affairs will continue. Indeed, we believe it should! A number of new and apparently productive relationships between schools and their clients were observed at system-wide, neighborhood, and school building levels. Both citizens and school officials noted satisfaction with these arrangements although the precise nature of their benefits is not yet apparent. At the very least, it can be said that capabilities to identify problems have been expanded and new resolve to cope with them has been generated.

In formulating these recommendations, we have not portrayed any specific mechanisms as exemplary models. Persons interested in any of the specific mechanisms we have discussed should contact those who participate in them for further information. Each of the modes of participation described in this report is a product of the context in which it was developed. What has been very successful in one setting may be less so in others. The recommendations in the following pages set forth some general directions for the future development of citizen participation.

New forms of citizen participation should be encouraged to promote educational accountability to the public.

Public responsibility for education has traditionally been seen as that of providing schools. What happens in these schools has been left pretty much to the educators who point out that much of how students perform is determined by out of school factors and to the students who may or may not be "motivated." By virtually any standards, this system has been one with considerable slippage in it. Teachers blame home influences for student performance, and parents accuse school personnel of not doing their jobs well. In very few instances has anybody assumed responsibility for seeing that parents, schools, and other community resources are coordinated to provide the best education possible for local students. This is what accountability is all about, and there is need for more of it.

Efforts to increase educational accountability undoubtedly will be threatening to some school people. This clearly has been the case in Ocean Hill-Brownsville. Our observations, however, indicated that the very serious difficulties of Ocean Hill-Brownsville constitute an exceptional case. In other locales, citizens and school people have cooperated more effectively to devise arrangements which, for the time being at least, are mutually satisfactory. Some school people even told us they welcomed the increased public attention to "quality control." For example, one administrator who has involved a lay advisory committee in selecting non-professional personnel has been so pleased that next year he plans to have the committee interview prospective teachers.

Because of their potential to involve human beings on emotional bases, the development of accountability mechanisms must be planned carefully. Jurisdictions and authority relationships must be defined clearly. These matters can be established through discussion among school and citizen leaders. The resolution which established the Pickett School Advisory Committee in Philadelphia is a good example. The committee will have an important role in evaluating the principal. He, in turn, will have sole responsibility to select and evaluate teachers. It also is important that citizens and school people come to know and understand each other's capabilities during the planning period. Community people, for example, must acknowledge their educational responsibilities as well as those of the schools. If such understandings can be achieved, more basic solutions to problems than replacing personnel can be sought.

An example of cooperative planning which can lead to new forms of accountability took place in Washington, D. C. during the summer of 1968. A summer-long workshop for neighborhood residents and school personnel (teachers, administrators, and non-professional employees) was held to plan the program and processes for directing a model school district in the Anacostia area.

Several modes of increasing accountability were observed by the study team. Fundamental to all of them was increased citizen knowledge about education in the community. In some instances, the development and subsequent dissemination of such knowledge was the primary goal of the mechanism. Newspapermen have long known that public accountability begins with public understanding. The school system study which makes deficiencies known to the public can be a useful change agent. If the study is done by citizens themselves as it was by the Detroit High School Study Commission, momentum for change is increased.

A second means of increasing accountability which merits replication in other settings is the use of the ombudsman concept. This concept which has been elaborated in earlier sections of the report provides the community with a man in the school system who can provide information and work for the redress of grievances. The school assessment committees established in Columbus, Ohio, are another new mode of participation which could be adopted by other locales.

A number of building level and neighborhood advisory committees were observed in preparing this report. All of them helped fulfill the accountability function to some extent, but, as noted above, some are more effective than others. In our judgment, the use of such mechanisms should be extended to other locales with their functions and responsibilities determined by local planning groups. It seems important, however, that for the accountability concept to become firmly established, the new mechanisms must be given some discretionary power. Citizen groups must be given the right to make some mistakes. The question of what mistakes a school system can afford is a difficult one which probably must be answered by local boards of education. Nevertheless, we urge a degree of boldness on this point. The principle of public accountability cannot be established unless the accountability mechanisms themselves are responsible to a broader public for their judgments.

Finally, we come to the notion of the mini-board or neighborhood controlling board. It is around this concept that the debate over school system decentralization and citizen participation currently rages. Our perception is that the neighborhood controlling board is not a distinct type of mechanism. It is instead one type of accountability mechanism, an extension of the forms discussed above. The essential difference is that members of a controlling board would rely less upon informal means of influencing school decisions because they would have greater authority themselves. As of this writing, it appears that no such board has been created and given a fair trial.

We are certain that neighborhood controlling boards like other citizen participation mechanisms are not in themselves the answer to the problems of education in our cities. However, the rationale for their capability to stimulate program change and to build community support for the schools is so persuasive that we urge their creation and trial in a limited number of situations. Extensive school-community planning and clear agreement about relationships with the central board of education must precede the establishment of such mechanisms.

Mechanisms designed to promote educational accountability to the public also can promote other purposes of citizen participation. By directing attention to how education should be provided in the community, such mechanisms can be a focal point for enlarging public understanding about and support for the schools, identifying local resources which can supplement school efforts, and articulating citizen expectations. Within this context, there is need for special efforts designed to stimulate interest in school programs among parents who, for one reason or another, are disinterested, fearful, or alienated. Effective ways to help such parents learn how to support their own children in quest of schooling must be established. Past failures and contemporary frustrations disqualify schools in many locales from leading in this endeavor. In areas where citizens are skeptical and distrustful of school people, initiative must come from community leaders. School officials must demonstrate new willingness to endorse bold experiments to stimulate parental support of education.

Much of the current interest in citizen participation stems from public uneasiness about the mounting conflict in urban society. The creation of citizen participation mechanisms is advocated by many persons as a short-range strategy for relieving tensions surrounding public institutions. Our view differs. In addition to their short-range potential for increasing accountability, we see citizen participation mechanisms as continuing and important features in the rational planning systems being developed for schools and other institutions. Planning processes for virtually all institutions are becoming increasingly rational due to expanding capabilities in information processing. Schools are no exception. Purpose defining and evaluation are fundamental steps in the planning process. Mechanisms which provide for citizen articulation of goals and accountability can contribute to these steps and should be institutionalized as long-range planning systems are developed.

Laymen and professionals must recognize jointly the magnitude of the task of achieving quality education for all youngsters in our cities. The dissipation of energies in hostile or defensive encounters leads absolutely nowhere. There must be recognition on the part of school people that schools are not their private preserves or sacred trusts. Citizens must acknowledge that schools are staffed by dedicated persons each trying to do his job well. The presence of baffling problems should not be interpreted as failure on the part of individuals or of institutions. If there has been failure the responsibility must be shared by the entire society. School officials and community leaders must put tradition aside and adopt an experimental philosophy toward new forms of participation in school affairs.

Communities must find new approaches to leadership development especially for education

One of the conclusions to be drawn from this survey is that we face a leadership plight. At the very moment when critical educational problems are surfacing, we are embarrassed by the limited supply of professional and lay leaders capable of coping with these problems. It is quite likely that such leadership scarcity is present in other fields as well. Although we have no empirical basis to make this judgment, there is probably sufficient leadership talent available to meet the requirements of our cities. But this leadership pool is largely unidentified and undeveloped.

School systems, local colleges and universities, community agencies, other local governments and institutions should collaborate on a massive lay leadership development effort. Procedurally the planning and operational responsibility may be allocated to particular interest sectors such as education but the program thrust should be addressed to the leadership needs of the total community.

Metropolitan areas could well afford to establish lay leadership development centers sponsored by a coalition of relevant community interests. Local colleges or universities might assume some responsibility for assisting with their establishment but such centers need not be dependent on sponsorship by educational institutions. Initially at least the centers could operate on the basis of volunteer faculty; housing for classes could be found in schools, churches, colleges, clubs, and businesses.

Leader training sessions for laymen could focus on improving the knowledge base vis-a-vis particular educational problems as well as incorporate leadership skill development emphases. Cadres of laymen drawn from all segments of the community could be assembled as the faculty for the leader development center. The knowledge component could be handled by a wide variety of persons. For example if the substantive educational issue were learning problems of minority group children, resource people could be sought from among school personnel, college and university faculties, juvenile authorities, psychiatrists, medical specialists, and other community agency personnel.

The faculty for skill development likewise could be drawn from many community sectors. Management development personnel from business and industry and group process specialists from colleges and universities could be involved. Specially trained staff competent in sensitivity training and instructional simulations might be located in many places. Actual internships or field experiences could be designed for laymen incorporating self-analysis and feedback techniques.

The population of potential leaders would include men and women from all socio-economic levels. Planners of leader development programs would need to differentiate training for the several categories of potential leaders. Indigenous leader prospects would need one type of preparation, middle class suburban housewives another, and candidates from the business and professional community still another.

Emphasis in leader training programs should be placed on teaching laymen how to get things done. They want to know what buttons to push, where the sensitive points are in the nervous system of school bureaucracies. Since confrontation is the name of the game, citizens must understand what the barriers to change in school systems are. Knowledge of the public school ideology, the values of teachers, administrators and school board members, the responsibilities of school board members, the financing of education constitute areas of substantive importance to laymen who wish to have an impact on schools.

The needs for revitalizing preparation of professional educational leaders--pre-service as well as in-service--are well known. In the context of this report we will speak only to developing skills in relating to laymen. Our appraisal is that many professional educators are deficient in both the knowledge and skill domains but that the skill problem may be more acute. Few of today's administrators have been prepared formally for confrontation politics. Contacts with militants, irate parents, or activist community groups are recent phenomena. Meeting challenges to the credibility of the school, responding to neighborhoods and communities in accountability terms, opening up the system for student participation are foreign to the experience of most school administrators. Administrators must learn to handle such matters comfortably and effectively.

Colleges and universities, in cooperation with school systems and other community bodies, are in the best position to take leadership in this arena. In fact it is their obligation. They must however broaden their concept of training, redefine school community relations, and examine thoroughly the changing internal and external expectations for school leaders.

School board members ought not be excluded either. School board service has undergone a transformation in recent years. The board member no longer enjoys a peaceful setting where he leisurely examines the superintendent's recommendations and subsequently endorses them without much controversy. Board rooms are popular places; people want decisions. They are far from sheltered environments to which board members can retreat for a clandestine review of educational policy alternatives.

Board member service is becoming more and more "public" service. Board members are called upon to share the reasoning behind their decisions with the public. More and more of the discussion among board members on educational matters is public debate. Likewise there are numerous contacts with laymen in and out of the board of education chambers. Board members like others need skills in these relationships. Programming for community leader development should include these individuals.

School systems must establish and refine new linkages to other sources of strength within their communities

Powerful new alliances among schools, business and industry, colleges and universities and other agencies within the cities studied may be the most encouraging development we have described. We wish to discuss just three in this portion of our report: (1) business, industry and schools; (2) colleges, universities, neighborhood organizations and schools; and (3) other external ties that have stimulative effects on schools and communities. We recommend that such efforts be extended in other cities.

Recent linkages of schools with business and industries in Michigan (not described in this report) offer wholesome new opportunities for strengthening secondary schools especially. The schools benefit through primary contacts with able people--professionals and technicians--made available to the schools. Business and industry benefit too through more intimate contact with an institution which has basic responsibility for developing a manpower pool. Sustained interaction between these partners enriches both domains.

Linkages can be classified by purpose and the number and type of partners involved. The more specialized and targeted the purpose, the fewer parties there appear to be to such alliances. Business and industry compacts with public schools must be developed around carefully selected objectives to be effective. The word adoption is used frequently to identify such relationships. This word begs the question, Adopted for what? School boards cannot legally relinquish responsibility for a school or a grouping of schools to a major business or industry. Nor can they expect a business or industrial establishment to assume financial responsibility or even job placement responsibility for schools. There are however, special objectives that are appropriate and achievable through such an alliance. One example would be the participation of school personnel and business or industrial personnel in refining students' orientations to employment. Another would be the utilization of the business or industry as a work experience laboratory. Still another would be the incorporation of certain highly skilled personnel from the business or industry into the teaching staff of the school either on a leave or part-time basis. The point is that specific objectives are possible, and immediate steps can be taken to implement programs that will lead to this achievement.

Another partnership, probably possessing the longest history and most impressive success record of those we noted is the Association of Huntsville Area Companies. It is large in scope and serves a broader range of purposes than does the "adoption" mechanism. We have referred to AHAC several times in this report. It has an enviable record of accomplishments earned since its establishment in 1963. The large scale commitment of business and industry members to its purposes, the quality of its leadership, the clarity of its relationships to the public schools, its predilection to initiate programs, and the availability of a four member staff have been significant in its success. There are in Huntsville situational factors that have contributed to its effectiveness as well (rapid growth, federal developments, small minority populations), but absence of these in other places does not detract from the attractiveness of adapting this mechanism for use elsewhere.

The most unique alliance we found involving institutions of higher education, community organizations and the schools is probably the Woodlawn Community Board in Chicago. This partnership has been nearly three years in the making. It has involved delegates from the Chicago Public Schools, the University of Chicago and the Woodlawn Organization, working thousands of hours together. The uniqueness is that the governance of a sector of the Chicago school district, the Woodlawn Experimental District just south of the University of Chicago campus, is to be in the hands of this board. It is not the same concept at all as is reflected in New York's attempts to decentralize and establish sub-district boards of education such as Ocean Hill-Brownsville. The plan for the Woodlawn Community Board is more complex, but, at the same time, more promising in our judgment. It is more complex because it incorporates a third partner, the University of Chicago, into the governance machinery. It is more promising because it has the resources of the community, a major university and the school system blended together in a common assault on educational and community problems. It is obvious that this design is limited in application to those places where there are urban universities and strong community organizations co-existing. The balance of power in the Woodlawn Community Board is such that the sharing of decision-making and its attendant responsibility does not jeopardize the special interests of any of the three partners.

The Franklin Improvement Program Committee in New York City brings together representatives from the school system, the community and Teachers College, Columbia University. The Committee which is incorporated has as its basic purpose to strengthen through closer school-community cooperation the program of the Benjamin Franklin High School. During its two year struggle to achieve a defensible operating base it has been applauded and damned in about equal measure. It differs from the Woodlawn Community Board experience in Chicago in these ways:

community involvement and representation is fuzzy in the FIPC, the commitment of the area university to the FIPC appears to be less firm, and the purpose of the mechanisms is less clear.

There are three important lessons to be learned from the above examples. First of all the establishment of a governing group and the definition of its rights and responsibilities vis-a-vis the school system and the other partners are achieved painfully and slowly. They require an amazing commitment of time and belief in the ultimate worth of the idea. Second, the mechanisms must incorporate in their basic rules and regulations complete detail about rights, obligations and responsibilities. This appears to be an absolute must should other communities choose to develop similar alliances. Third, progress is built upon the unequivocal support of top authorities in the school systems, the universities, and the community organizations.

There were a surprising number of other examples of participation on the part of college and university personnel with school systems. One particular example of limited university involvement but with high return was the contribution of a sociologist at the University of Montana at Duluth. His work was with the selection of indigenous leaders to serve on Model City Task Forces including one in education. In cooperation with Model City officials and school leaders, he designed and administered a complex system for identifying potential leaders from neighborhoods in the model city area of Duluth. After identifying potential leaders through a creative nomination technique, he tested them for leadership skills and commitment through a simulation device. A large pool of nominees was narrowed effectively and the necessary number of neighborhood task force leaders was chosen. Everyone benefited from this arrangement. The community identified and selected its leaders; the school system participated in the process and learned a great deal about indigenous leader populations, their values and aspirations; the sociologist tested empirically a number of his ideas.

Additional examples of productive involvements of colleges and universities could be highlighted. Obviously, these should be extended. The key to their success, as is true with all of the mechanisms, is commitment. Nothing worthwhile comes out of the use of the "good" name of the university only. Goals are achieved when dedicated people become engaged mutually in their pursuit.

We found considerable responsiveness on the part of school systems to stimuli external to the cities, or to some communities within the cities. Such linkages are of course more tenuous than those described above. We noted that many mechanisms owed their origins to federal programs sponsored by the Office of Economic Opportunity (OEO), the Office of Education (OE), or in the case of the Model Cities, Housing and Urban Development (HUD). The Model Cities influence was particularly visible (Duluth, Huntsville, Atlanta, Philadelphia, Detroit). The companion prescriptions in Model City development calling for citizen involvement and imaginative new approaches to urban education appear to be leading in positive directions. We recommend that groups maintain external liaisons of this sort seeking both ideas and fiscal support.

Foundations too are providing stimulation to local citizen participation efforts. They need not be viewed only as prospects for fiscal resource but as sources of ideas too. The foundations were not principal partners in any of the linkages we reviewed although some of the groups studied were seeking or had been granted foundation help.

Cities have substantial resources within themselves. The problems are severe indeed but the strength to apply to their solutions is likewise imposing. Genius is required in finding ways to link the sources of strength in a common assault. There are in embryo in the cities designs to reach that objective.

Existing structures for citizen participation must be strengthened

As noted at the outset of this report, citizen interest in schools is not a new phenomenon. Formal structures to make citizen involvement possible have existed since the New England town meetings of the seventeenth century. Today it is apparent, however, that citizen interest in urban schools especially has heightened and that traditional means of accommodating it are no longer adequate. While some new mechanisms certainly are needed, the capability of existing structures to facilitate citizen involvement can and should be strengthened.

The problems of relations between and among the races (including racism) although subdued and glossed over many times are prominent in school-community interactions. It is more comfortable for most to ignore racial issues or to act as if they were not significant variables. But racial matters are there and as such must be dealt with and respected.

Changes in board of education procedures are called for in many instances. School board business should be conducted openly in public meetings. Citizens should be encouraged to attend these meetings and make their views known. More than formal procedures for hearing from citizens who wish to address the board are necessary. An atmosphere of openness and willingness to entertain and respond to public comments and complaints is appropriate. In short, it is a responsibility of school boards to operate as if their business is the business of concerned citizens, even those whose circumstances are humble or those who criticize the schools severely.

The times are such that new efforts to bring boards of education into closer contact with the public are warranted. Procedures such as televising meetings, rotating meetings among neighborhood sites, and opening meetings of board committees to the public can be helpful in this regard. A bolder step would be to provide staff assistance to board of education members on the order of that available to Congress. Board of education members in most cities receive far more requests, complaints, and comments from citizens than they can consider seriously in the time which they can devote to school affairs. Staff assistance would aid school board members in dealing with such matters thereby strengthening linkages with their constitutents. By increasing their capability to deal with public concerns, school boards would bolster their public image as bodies to whom school bureaucracies are accountable.

Most city school systems have had departments of public information or community relations for many years. Their function in most instances has been to tell the public the good things which school officials want them to know. Two changes are called for in cities where they have not been made. First, information about the status and progress of the school system should be made available to the public and progress of the school system should be made available to the public on a regular basis whether it is favorable or not. Perhaps the best contemporary example is the sharing of median achievement scores for schools in the system.

Citizens have a right to know the weaknesses as well as the strengths of their school system. Public knowledge is the cornerstone of public accountability.

The second change called for in many school systems is greater effort in listening to and deriving information from the community. The strategy of employing community workers to go into neighborhoods to determine the concerns of residents and aid them in petitioning the school system is a useful one which should be employed in more cities.

Local Parent Teacher Associations have a long history in many cities. Meetings, however, often are poorly attended and avoid subjects of controversy and significance. Nevertheless, the PTA has an established and prestigious heritage which can be built upon in many areas. Citizens concerned with improving school programs often find the local PTA an essentially dormant organization which is receptive to their efforts. Citizen initiative in this direction is to be encouraged. School officials could assist in revitalizing PTA groups by declaring their willingness to see agendas opened and programs expanded to any area of citizen concern. Workshops for PTA leaders sponsored by the schools, local universities, or other local groups could aid in this purpose.

Finally, lay advisory committees which presently exist in many school systems can be strengthened in a number of ways. Such groups should have their responsibilities defined clearly and be given staff assistance, time and help to become knowledgeable about their task and the school system, and ready access to top school officials.

Leadership and sanctioning agencies should encourage citizen participation in school affairs

In many cities, federal, state, or foundation officials have played important roles in developing citizen participation mechanisms. Often it has been insistence by these outside funding sources which started local people thinking about new forms of citizen involvement. A recent example was sponsorship by the U. S. Office of Education of the Central Cities Project. Similarly, the revised 1968 criteria for projects under Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act called for "appropriate organizational arrangements" for community and parent involvement.

As noted earlier, requirements of external agencies have been a strategic resource of citizens advocating changes in school programs. Representatives of these agencies, however, have served as other than invokers of sanctions. In some instances, they have been catalysts for bringing diverse local groups together. They also have been the source of some creative ideas implemented in various cities. In summary, leadership and sanctioning agencies have been an important stimulus to expanded citizen participation. They should continue in this role.

Some Random and Concluding Thoughts

We have spent considerable time and resources in describing what we saw. We might also comment on what we didn't see. For one thing we didn't see ease and simplicity in the joining of school and community forces. All of the forms we have reviewed are the products of extensive personal and/or group investment in the belief that schools can be better than they are. Similarly we did not note much of the feeling that if we could just destroy "the establishment" we would find our way quickly to strong new institutions. Laymen and professionals with whom study team members visited were for the most part realists. They seasoned their enthusiasms for change with the recognition of dimensions of the task ahead.

This analysis began with reference to several questions used by study team members in the field as guidelines for gathering information about participation. The first of these--(who participates and whom do they represent?) can only be answered in the most general of terms. We did not survey quantitatively the numbers of participants for obvious reasons. We did discover that the range of participation is extensive and the forms in which it goes forward are equally varied. Some participants speak for or represent only themselves. Others represent either implicitly or explicitly certain defined constituencies. The constituencies are often homogeneous such as the model city's education task force in Duluth or heterogeneous like the urban education coalition in Columbus. In sum, participation is a "mixed bag" and that is probably as it should be.

The forum for participation, our second guideline question, revealed participatory mechanisms designed to affect education and educational policy at all levels--the classroom, building, sub-district, regional, state and national levels. The issues addressed and tactics utilized (questions three and four) were similarly dispersed. Definitive review of the strategies of participation appear in the observations section of the report.

Participants do possess sanctions, our fifth question. They can for example vote negatively on school issues or withhold their vote. They can threaten actions and carry them out against the school system. They can refuse to participate in affairs designed by school officials such as citizen committees or volunteer worker programs. There is a large reserve of latent power that participants alone control.

We found it difficult to appraise such issues as the following. What happens? Who responds? How are programs changed as a consequence of participation? (question six). Many new forms of participation have not yet made any history to evaluate. Other appraisals are best described as the "visceral feelings" about effectiveness that participants have. Little objective data are available which would permit us to attribute changes in school program or improved learning to participation. Nevertheless we would not recommend reducing or discontinuing participation for this reason. We may never be able to tie school improvements definitively to participation.

An attempt was made to ascertain the relation of participatory mechanisms to traditional school decision-makers (question seven) and how the mechanisms were perceived by various parties in the community (question eight). We learned that those perceptions were as varied as the mechanisms themselves. Some thought they were creative, magnificent, hitting the mark; others saw them as tools of the establishment and an extravagant waste of time.

Short of an exhaustive empirical analysis of effectiveness we can only offer our judgment. We believe participation to be an imperative; we urge high priority for the continued invention and refinement of new mechanisms; and we caution that perseverance and humility are required on the part of school person and citizen alike.

APPENDIX

Citizen Participation Mechanisms in Thirteen Cities

The following mechanisms for citizen participation were observed in the cities under which they are listed. It should be noted that the mechanisms described here are not the only ones in any of these cities. Included in this account are forms of citizen participation which (1) are considered particularly unique and/or promising, and/or (2) indicate the range of citizen participation options observed by the study team.

Space limitations preclude incorporation of the detailed information which provided the basis for many of the observations in other sections of this report. Thus this section should not be considered a presentation of study findings in the strict sense of that term. It is offered instead as a brief catalogue of mechanisms which emphasizes procedures for involving citizens and the issues which are addressed by them. We have chosen this form of presentation because most of these vehicles are quite new and little is known about them. At this time it seems useful simply to identify the range of mechanisms which are in existence. Given the extremely fluid and sometimes volatile history of some of these mechanisms, it is necessary to point out that these descriptions were written in the early fall of 1968. Conditions may have changed dramatically since that time.

Atlanta, Georgia

The Parent Involvement Committee (PIC) is comprised of approximately fifty parents (almost all mothers of school children), two PTA representatives, the principal and a few other faculty members at the Crogman Elementary School. The committee was created in response to Title I (ESEA) guidelines and works at the school building level. It was organized by school officials in the fall of 1967 along with similar committees serving other Title I schools. Activities to date have included working on beautification of the school and its surroundings, preparing and arranging pictures for use in classes, assisting teachers with classroom activities, producing a monthly newsletter for parents, visiting homes of children who are absent from school over long periods, and encouraging parents in the neighborhood to read with their children.

The Second Ward Civil League is an informal community organization of residents of a poor black neighborhood, non-resident (white and black) businessmen and other persons with interests in the neighborhood. The group has no formal members, meets at the call of the chairman, and attracts as many as 150 or more people to meetings. The group has successfully worked for a new school in the neighborhood, a new park, a parent-child center, legislative redistricting to give black representation to the community, adult education and Head Start programs in the neighborhood and peaceful integration of two local schools. The group is not school-sponsored, but a neighborhood principal (who lives across town) has been influential within it. The basic tactic of the group has been to work quietly and present "needs, not demands" to authorities in positions to respond.

Perry Homes Residents live in the largest public housing development in Atlanta. Parents and other interested residents in the area have prodded the board of education to build more schools; to add libraries, shop facilities, and cafeterias in schools where they were not provided initially; and to provide Title I programs and other special services for this low-income neighborhood. Organization has been on an ad hoc issue basis but residents regularly seize opportunities to make their needs known to public officials by appearing at formal and informal meetings. Neighborhood leaders have threatened to picket the schools. They have not done so because they believe to date they have been successful in negotiating agreements with school officials.

The Summit Leadership Conference (SLC) was established in 1964 by representatives of more than one hundred Negro organizations and has concerned itself with a wide variety of city-wide issues. In some situations, the board of education has regarded the group as representative of Negro opinion in the city and attempted to negotiate with its leaders when troubles appeared. The group has presented demands to the board and received satisfaction on some occasions (e.g. demands for factual information). Dissatisfaction with school board response on other issues, however, led some members of the group to circulate petitions to recall the entire board of education. This action was not supported by all group members; factionalism has led to a decline in support for and prestige of the conference during the past year.

Boston, Massachusetts

The King-Timility Joint Advisory Council is an amalgam of the King School Advisory Council (comprised of the principal, three teachers, two representatives from Exodus, the Home and School Association President, and two representatives from Harvard University) and the Timility School Advisory Council (comprised of the principal, three teachers, six parents, and the same two representatives from Harvard University). Both councils were creatures of an ESEA Title III Central Cities Task Force proposal. This proposal states that a partnership exists between the councils and the Boston School Department.

The council has the power to initiate recommendations for spending money for the project (the school department cannot spend money without such a recommendation), but the money must go through the school department. The Boston School Committee (Board of Education) must approve all action by the school department and the council. To date, the project has been marked by disagreement among the principal parties as to the advisory-control functions of the council. This issue became focused at the beginning of the 1968-69 school year when school officials appointed new white principals to the King and Timility schools. The council was not consulted on this action and proceeded to make it a public issue. After protestations by the council, intransigent statements by school officials, discussions, and threats of violence, the two white principals requested a transfer and were replaced by two black assistant principals on one year appointments.

Operation Exodus is a "grass roots" organization which began in 1965 with the efforts of parents to bus black children from ghetto schools to less-crowded schools in white neighborhoods. The organization has matured and expanded. It now has a black board of directors comprised of business, parent, and professional leaders in Roxbury and employs a staff of skilled black administrators. In addition to the busing program which has been continued, Exodus includes a community organizer program which employs black organizers to solicit community backing for the group; a cultural enrichment program; a referral program for jobs, psychological help, and other services, and an investigations department which seeks out information about legitimate black complaints and tries to aid in resolving these complaints.

Citizens for Boston Schools is a school committee watchdog group dominated by articulate liberals in Boston. They have supported "reform candidates" for election to the school committee but have had few successes in these efforts to date. Nevertheless, the "Citizens" provide a forum for the expression of discontent by covering school committee meetings, issuing press releases, and holding meetings.

New Schools have been founded by several groups in the Boston ghetto. These schools constitute private alternatives for ghetto parents frustrated with the city public schools. Support for them comes from foundations, social agencies, and private donors. They are small and not yet firmly established but try hard to be responsive to local concerns. Their presence represents a dramatic break from commitment to public schooling and an advanced form of citizen protest.

The Committee for Community Education Development (CCED) is an outgrowth of 1967 Massachusetts legislation enabling creation of experimental public schools bypassing established city school systems. The CCED is comprised of Harvard and MIT officials, civil rights leaders, state administrators, and community (black) leaders who are planning such an experimental school system to be located in Boston. Plans call for an eventual school governing board comprised of six parents, three students, three school staff members, three community spokesmen, and three CCED members.

Chicago, Illinois

The Woodlawn Community Board assumed responsibility for developing a proposal for the Woodlawn Experimental District and has continued to serve as the operating advisory group for the Woodlawn Experimental District. Woodlawn is a poor, black neighborhood immediately south of the University of Chicago campus. The Woodlawn Community Board composed of powerful and once antagonistic groups is comprised of seven delegates from each of three organizations--the Chicago Public Schools, the Woodlawn Organization (a community organization based on the premise of "self-determination" which at one time was a strong institutional opponent of the public schools and the University), and the University of Chicago. Voting within the board on critical issues is by delegation; the vote of any one delegation may veto proposals by the others. This provision has led to great efforts in board meeting discussions to resolve disagreements and achieve consensus.

The Woodlawn Experimental District is in its formative stages, but the board already has dealt effectively with several questions of significance. Among these have been agreement to retain the tripartite arrangement established to develop the proposal as a basis for governing the experimental program, determination of the schools in which the experimental program will focus, and several key personnel assignments. Efforts in the program currently include developing improved ways for students (particularly high school students) and parents to participate in planning.

The Drake/South Commons School has been the focus of cooperative efforts by Chicago public school officials, a community organization representing five public housing developments in the near south side of the city (IPACAC) and a group of housing developers who are endeavoring to build a stable, integrated, family-based community (South Commons) in the area.

From the outset, it was clear to these developers that white and black middle-class residents of their new community would be reluctant to send their children to the existing Drake School which drew its enrollment from the black, low-income population of the nearby Prairie Courts housing development. Working with the school administration and IPACAC, the developers have erected a community building within the South Commons project in which spaces have been leased as classrooms to the public schools. Representatives of the three cooperating groups have developed a plan which considers the Drake and South Commons School a single educational unit with a joint program. The Drake/South Commons School has a single parent advisory board which includes residents from Prairie Courts and South Commons.

Columbus, Ohio

An Urban Education Coalition was formed in the fall of 1968 as a loose alliance of leaders from all sectors of human activity in the Columbus metropolitan area. Charter members of the coalition included representatives of city and suburban boards of education, religious leaders, businessmen, civil rights organizers, labor officials, community organization leaders, service club representatives, government officials, teachers and housewives. After an initial period of organizational activity, membership on the coalition has been opened to any citizen who would like to work on one of the coalition task forces.

The purposes of the coalition are to assist in clarifying educational goals for the metropolitan area and to seek out, release, and channel the problem-solving capacity of the metropolitan community into areas of educational importance. While the coalition perhaps will sponsor some programs of its own, its principal strategies are those of offering recommendations and mobilizing community resources for action within existing structures.

The working groups within the coalition will be task forces. Task forces have been established to work in the areas of vocational education, innovation in education, urban educational policy, appraising the school product, citizen participation, recruitment and preparation of teachers, and pre-school, after school, and summer-school programs.

School Assessment Committees were established on an experimental basis for three high schools during the 1968-69 school year. Membership on each committee includes three teachers chosen by their peers, two students, the building principal, and six community leaders appointed by the board of education. The committees meet at least once a month and will present a report at least annually to the faculty, the PTA, other interested citizens, and the board of education. Purposes of the committees are to review achievement and other test data, discuss proposed boundary changes, examine enrollment changes and mobility patterns, react to proposals for curriculum changes, counsel about community resources that can strengthen school programs, discuss drop-out and graduate follow-up statistics, evaluate disciplinary practices, and mediate community-school grievances.

The Ad Hoc Committee of Parents for Quality Education was formed by a group of parents whose children attend a local ghetto school. Leadership in this effort came from a mother of seven children who was displeased because her seventh grade son who had received above average grades for six years could not enroll in a foreign language class. Upon pressing the point, she was told that her son could read only at the fourth grade level. The mother protested that the school system had not told her that her son was reading below grade level nor provided him with remedial help. At about the same time the Columbus Urban League released a report indicating widespread disparity of achievement among inner-city and out-city schools.

Aided by representatives of the Urban League and the NAACP, the ad hoc committee sponsored discussion about education in the inner-city and conducted a door-to-door canvass of residents in one ghetto neighborhood. As a result of these activities a list of demands (e.g. a library and librarian in the local school, a hot lunch and breakfast program, a more meaningful PTA) was formulated and presented to the board of education. Displeased with the response of school officials, the committee sponsored the first boycott in Columbus school history in October of 1967. More than 300 children stayed home from the neighborhood school that day and most of them attended the freedom schools set up in the neighborhood.

The activities of the ad hoc committee received wide attention in the community and helped win widespread support for inner-city school improvements. Program improvements (including libraries and a lunch program) were made in several inner-city schools by early 1968. Although the ad hoc committee disbanded, its efforts along with those of the Urban League and the NAACP contributed to the decision by school officials to request a comprehensive study of local school programs.

Following the completion of this study and its endorsement by the board of education, persons who were active with the ad hoc committee joined with other community leaders to back a successful campaign for an increase of more than twenty percent in school operating funds.

Detroit, Michigan

The Miller District Demonstration Project involves a grass roots organization of citizens working to improve schools in the Miller Junior High School District. Charter members of the group include fifteen citizens and two social workers. This group organized a series of community workshops in which local problems were aired and neighborhood consensus was developed. A subsequent step was the development of a program proposal which was submitted to and later funded by the Detroit Board of Education. These funds have been used to support demonstration projects in the area; the Miller District Advisory Council has been established to relate to the program.

The advisory council includes representatives of parents, teachers, and neighborhood social and welfare organizations. Parents and social workers involved in the project have identified local problems and confronted educators with them. Issues and problems which have been dealt with include administrator consultation with community representatives, periodic review of curricular content by parents, improvement in teaching-learning techniques, school-home relationships, special services, a pre-school program, provision of funds for the project by the school system, and a continuing program of evaluation.

The Neighborhood Services Program was established within a local junior high school district as a forerunner of the Detroit Model Cities program. It is an attempt to demonstrate the benefits of cooperation among local agencies in the identification and solution of broad social problems. The major decision-making body for the project is a board of directors comprised of representatives from twenty agencies providing services in the area and twenty citizens who reside in the area. The major issue so far, which concerns the public schools, has been the relevance of formal education to the world of work. However, the organization is less than a year old so its history has been largely one of establishing institutional boundaries and roles.

The High School Study Commission consisted of fifty-one influential citizens appointed by school officials and charged with over-seeing the study of each high school by a local study committee. The commission selected local area citizens to serve on each of the twenty-two high school study teams. Although criteria for selecting these citizens were not explict, each team included housewives, businessmen, regional PTA members, and some Negroes. Staff help was provided for each of the committees and comprehensive reports were prepared and made public. In addition to endorsing the reports of the individual study teams, the commission released a general report on the rationale for the high school curriculum, current status of the high school curriculum, recommendations for innovation and curriculum reform, relationships between the central administration and the schools, personnel, school-community relations, and finance.

The Ad Hoc Committee of Citizens Interested in Equal Educational Opportunities was created in 1965 because of dissatisfaction with the rate at which a 1962 report on equal educational opportunity was being implemented in the schools. The original committee had approximately seventy members who were active in community organizations interested in equality of opportunity (e.g. CORE, NAACP, Urban League, the unions). Issues addressed by the committee included the need for integrated teaching staffs in all schools, integrating student bodies, participation of black students in all apprenticeship programs sponsored by the board of education, and curriculum reform.

The New Detroit Committee was appointed by the mayor and the governor following the 1967 riots in Detroit. The original committee was comprised of thirty-nine persons including members of the "white establishment," black militants, and black and white moderates. Every member is the top decision-maker in his organization or agency. Although initially viewed as a temporary organization, the group has incorporated and begun to hire staff members. Eight task forces have been formed to deal with particular social problem areas including education. In the area of education, special concern has been expressed for deficiencies in student achievement and the need for greater community involvement in school affairs.

The Project Advisory Committee for New School Buildings has been a form of citizen participation existing in Detroit for almost ten years. Whenever a building site is to be selected, a new building erected, or an existing building rehabilitated, a project advisory committee is created. This committee typically contains parent, community, and student representation as well as delegates from the school architect's office and the parks and recreation division of city government. Assistance is available to the committee from the building and curriculum departments of the school system, and local administrative and custodial staff members are involved in its deliberations. The function of the committee is to develop educational specifications for the new construction and to present these specifications to school officials in the presence of the board of education.

Duluth, Minnesota

The Model Cities Education Task Force is comprised of four "neighborhood foremen," four "leadership volunteers" who hold responsible leadership positions in the city, and an education specialist who is director of federal programs for the public schools. Neighborhood foremen are residents of the model neighborhood who were selected on the basis of a neighborhood sample survey which asked residents to nominate persons in whom they have confidence. Persons nominated were invited to a series of meetings at which they were simultaneously screened for leadership skills and given the opportunity to select themselves out of contention for the positions. Persons close to this selection process expressed confidence that it identified foremen who enjoy the trust and respect of model neighborhood residents.

The task force is presently developing a proposal which requests Model City program operating funds. Activities of the task force to date have been to survey educational problems in the model neighborhood by talking with residents, teachers, and school administrators and to propose establishment of a community school. If the local Model City program becomes operational, the board of foremen will become a neighborhood policy committee.

The Follow Through Policy Advisory Board is comprised of seventeen members who were selected by the school administration from among community aides, teacher aides, and parents who had been serving in advisory positions to the local Head Start program. Future members of the board will be elected by the present members. The board was formed to conform with Office of Economic Opportunity guidelines and to facilitate expanded community participation in the Follow Through Program which is an extension of the Head Start concept into grades one, two, and three. The board has been active in selecting children and non-professional staff members to participate in the program. They also have worked to secure parent volunteers and have made several suggestions for increasing parent involvement in the program. These recommendations have been accepted by the school system.

The Duluth Schools Human Relations Committee was formed in 1967 to provide a city-wide group which could be of assistance to the board of education by studying and offering recommendations about human relations problems. Of the forty-one original committee members, twenty were teachers or administrators from the public schools and local universities and twelve were representatives of organizations active locally in the area of human relations. Actions which the group has taken include recommending creation of a staff position within the school system to work full-time at improving human relations, sponsoring an open forum where diverse community viewpoints were presented, studying and recommending changes in school board policy dealing with religion and public education, and considering minority complaints about inaccuracies and biases in instructional materials.

The Duluth Committee of One-Hundred was appointed by the board of education to give public direction to the planning of a post high school technical institute for the city. Membership on the committee includes business leaders, labor leaders, board of education members, and representatives from social and educative agencies within the city. The committee first considered the need for such a facility, sought resources to support it, and has subsequently addressed the question of what types of curriculum should be offered by the school.

Huntsville, Alabama

The Association of Huntsville Area Companies (AHAC) began in 1963 as an organization of sixteen Huntsville companies concerned primarily with promoting equal employment opportunity. Present membership includes forty-one companies representing approximately 18,000 employees. Its organizational purposes now emphasize the promotion of equal educational opportunity. AHAC company representatives (approximately seventy persons) meet monthly as does the nine-man executive committee. A professional staff of four persons directs program activities. As AHAC began its work to prepare disadvantaged residents for employment, the group discovered that there were complex problems in matching disadvantaged adults, many of whom had been employed in the cotton processing industries, with technical, engineering, and related jobs. Remedial classes in English, mathematics, vocabulary, speech, electronics, algebra, and spelling were offered by industry and taught primarily by qualified personnel from the participating companies. AHAC also used the Manpower Development and Training Act to support classes in particular skill areas. AHAC gradually became involved with the schools by initiating a cooperative program which provided students in local schools and colleges opportunities to refine skills in actual job situations, by offering scholarships to students, providing grants to area institutions including gifts of needed equipment and teaching aids, and loaning competent personnel of member firms to engage in instructional programs.

The concern of AHAC with improving educational programs in disadvantaged schools has been especially great. The organization worked with the Madison County and Huntsville school systems and institutions of higher education in designing an early childhood education program, the Educational Improvement Program (EIP). The genesis of this program, which was funded for five years by a major foundation, came from AHAC. The project proposal was submitted by AHAC, naming the city school system as project administrator. Curriculum improvement, in-service teacher education, parent involvement, and institutional cooperation are major objectives of EIP.

Other educational projects in which AHAC has cooperated with public school officials include: (1) development of

Project Follow-Through (a program similar to that discussed in the preceding section about Duluth); (2) School Counselor-Orientation-Reassessment-Enrichment (SCORE), a program which increases the familiarity of school counselors with the world of work by employing them in member firms during the summer and offering supplementary seminars, conferences, and academic work; (3) an ESEA Title III program dealing with professional improvement and curriculum development; (4) a comprehensive survey of educational programs for resource allocating decisions; (5) development of a resource personnel file for classroom enrichment; and (6) continued exploration of possible areas of cooperation among local institutions.

The Huntsville Education Study Committee was established by the Huntsville Board of Education in compliance with a 1967 Alabama law mandating the establishment of a citizens committee in every local district to assess the quality of the schools. The Huntsville committee consists of acknowledged community leaders and is organized into four task groups concerned with instructional programs, facilities, school finance, and community relations respectively. The committee is quite active; for example, it has published a comprehensive questionnaire in the local newspaper inviting citizens to express attitudes and opinions about school matters. Board of education members anticipate receiving a number of helpful recommendations from the group.

Los Angeles, California

Three Citizens Compensatory Education Advisory Committees were established by the school system to comply with state guidelines for implementing ESEA Title I programs. Each of the three committees has thirty-four members including seventeen who represent other agencies (e.g. welfare, labor, government) involved with the poor and seventeen parents of students enrolled in compensatory programs. Although rules governing the operation of the committees establish their functions as advisory and specifically deny them "a veto over Title I or over any other compensatory education programs," they, in fact, have been quite influential regarding these programs. They have argued successfully for the continuation of a particular counseling program and the retention of full-time staff assistance to the committees in the face of a proposal to reduce this assistance. They have also influenced the nature of Title I program components.

School-Community Relations Consultants have worked in neighborhoods as employees of the Los Angeles City Schools. Each consultant generally assumes responsibility for working in a number of poverty areas. The formal responsibility of the consultants is to "improve communication and understanding between the school and the community in officially identified disadvantaged areas." One way to describe the role of the school-community consultant is that of an advisor to community residents about how to work with the school system. School officials seek advice or help from the consultants in solving difficult community-related problems. The school-community relations workers have been an important source of information to school people about problems, grievances, and activities in various communities. It is a significant way for the school system to keep its ear to the ground in the poverty sectors of the city.

The Educational Issues Coordinating Committee was formed by leaders in the Los Angeles Mexican-American community at a time when high school students in this neighborhood were boycotting the schools in protest. Neighborhood dissatisfaction with school system response to this protest resulted in the formation of this committee. The committee has developed its own list of grievances regarding the school system and has met on a weekly basis since it began. Attendance at meetings ranges from 75 to 200 persons, most of whom are parents. The group has been influential in achieving reinstatement of a neighborhood high school teacher who had been transferred to a downtown office job because he was an alleged leader of the student boycotts. They also were successful in urging the transfer of at least one teacher out of a neighborhood school. Perhaps, most important, the group has convinced enough members of the board of education of its representativeness and relatively moderate views that school officials have been encouraged to work with and consult them about neighborhood school questions.

New York, New York

The Franklin Improvement Program Committee (FIPC) is an incorporated body which acts in an advisory relationship to New York City school officials regarding matters concerning Benjamin Franklin High School. The plenary power of school officials has been maintained by a controversial provision that the Franklin School principal can veto any action taken by the FIPC. General business of the FIPC is conducted by its board of directors which may have from nine to seventeen members and must include representation from certain parent, community, teacher, administrator, student and welfare organizations.

Meetings of the FIPC are open to representatives of any community organization, and members may place any items they wish on the agenda. The meetings have served as a useful community forum for educational problems. Deliberations of the FIPC have contributed to several program changes in the school. Among these have been the Franklin cluster plan (implementation of the "school within a school" concept), rules and security procedures related to narcotics peddling and usage in and around the school, an instructional project in computer technology, and the remodeling of the student government. The FIPC must sanction all new programs introduced in the school.

Its advocates contend that the FIPC is a valuable "community listening post" which enables diverse and often antagonistic groups to communicate with each other and at times achieve consensus on educational issues of concern to the community. To its critics, however, it is a cooptative ploy of the school principal and other establishment professionals. Opponents say it has little influence upon key policy decisions and represents only the parents and community leaders who support the establishment.

The Ruppert Renewal Project Committee (RRPC) was appointed by the mayor and the Manhattan borough president in 1966 to involve citizens in planning for an urban renewal project on the site of the old Ruppert Brewery. Appointment of this committee recognized the effort of a small group of upper Manhattan residents who had been urging public development on this site since 1961. The appointed chairman of the RRPC was the woman who organized the early community effort to have the land designated for public use. Membership on this committee was citizen-based and quite heterogeneous. In 1966, a fifty member parent group, the Parents Education Committee (PEC) was established as a subsidiary of RRPC to plan for a new high school on the site. Active PEC members include parents, community workers and leaders, school professional staff, and members of the local board of education. Early efforts of this group to have their proposals considered by the board of education were unsuccessful as they tried every legitimate means to contact the board without success. The PEC came to the attention of the city board of education as a result of prodding by new members of the city government who were close to the group.

City board of education members were appalled to learn in the spring of 1968 that the PEC had tried to contact them through legitimate channels, that the PEC had invited and received staff members at their meetings during the previous three years, and that the board was just discovering who and what PEC was. The PEC group finally was given a mandate by the board of education to plan the Park East High School.

The Ocean Hill-Brownsville Governing Board is presently the most visible and famous of all community-centered participatory mechanisms. At the time this report was written, the Ocean Hill-Brownsville Board was embroiled in a bitter dispute with the New York City teachers union and the New York City Board of Education over personnel prerogatives. This controversy has projected the issues of decentralization and community control into national prominence. The recency, volatility and dynamic nature of events in the Ocean Hill-Brownsville experimental school district suggest that the mechanism be given attention in the present report but simultaneously make analysis extremely difficult.

The governing board was officially approved by the New York City Board of Education in 1967 and has six elementary and two intermediate schools under its jurisdiction. Plans for the Ocean Hill-Brownsville experimental district and governing board were developed in 1967 by a foundation-supported steering committee (later augmented and called a planning board) which was asked by the New York City Board of Education to submit a plan for decentralization. Membership on the planning board included two community representatives, presidents of the Parents Associations affiliated with each of the Ocean Hill-Brownsville schools, teachers from each of the schools, representatives of the principals and assistant principals, and a university professor who had worked with the community to improve communications with the schools.

During the summer of 1967, this planning group asked community residents to sign two petitions. One petition was to acknowledge that citizens in the community had been informed of the goals of the decentralization project and the impending election of the governing board. The other petition was to nominate parent candidates for the governing board. The name of any parent with thirty or more nominations as parent representative for each of the schools was placed on the ballot and an election was held in August, 1967. Seven parent members of the governing board were selected in this election; they in turn chose five community leaders for board membership. Other members included a teacher representative from each of the schools, two representatives of the district's supervisory staff, an ex-officio teachers union representative, and the aforementioned university professor.

The roots of the Ocean Hill controversy can be traced to disagreements which plagued the original planning group. Parent, teacher, and community representatives to this body were in basic agreement except on the matters of who was to have ultimate authority to determine employment conditions and to conduct staff evaluations. Guidelines on these matters were not provided by the New York Board of Education, nor were the respective responsibilities of the city board and the local governing board clearly demarcated. Disagreement and vagueness surrounding these points continued as the newly-established governing board began to function. The saliency of these issues has been reflected in the events of fall, 1968.

The Two Bridges Model School District includes five schools which serve a heterogeneous neighborhood on Manhattan's Lower

East Side. Early planning for this experimental project was done by a planning council composed of five teachers (one from each of the five schools in the district), a teacher at large who was the union district chairman, five parents (one representing each school), a parent at large who represented the United Parents Association of New York City, and six community representatives elected by the Two Bridges Neighborhood Council. The city board of education approved the project in summer, 1967. The planning phase was supported by a foundation grant. The planning council made vigorous efforts to gain community involvement in and support of the decentralization experiment by holding frequent meetings and distributing many flyers and newsletters.

Several issues have threatened the success of the project. Among the most prominent have been divisiveness among parents over the extent to which they should work within or outside established school channels, parent-teacher conflict over plans to control teacher employment and assess teacher performance, and ambiguity about the role of principals and assistant principals in the project. In December, 1967, a governing council for the project was elected using procedures similar to those employed in Ocean Hill-Brownsville. This governing council is supposed to have general control of the schools within the district. It also is supposed to work closely with the New York Board of Education to determine jointly policy on matters like budget, zoning, curriculum, evaluation, and audit procedures. The problem of course in New York City has been the difficulty of defining what "jointly" means. Essentially the same ambiguities which have provoked open conflict in Ocean Hill-Brownsville are present in the Two Bridges Model School District.

Philadelphia, Pennsylvania

The Citizens Committee on Public Education in Philadelphia (CCPEP) was formed in 1958 to bring public pressure to bear upon a school system criticized by reform-minded citizens for emphasizing economy rather than education. The group incorporated under the charter of a former citizens group, hired an executive director, and began its work with a successful campaign to change the method of selecting local board of education members. CCPEP is open to all interested citizens. The fifty member governing board of the group thus far has been self-perpetuating and includes concerned housewives, clergymen, businessmen, and attorneys. Most business of the CCPEP is handled by the executive director and twelve-man executive committees. Activities of the group include sponsorship of subcommittee studies of particular school problems and taking public stands on these problems or on rather specific crises in the life of the school district. Characteristic actions are to issue letters of commendation or criticism, to present press releases setting forth the CCPEP position on particular issues, and to work at mobilizing support from a broad range of civic-minded groups.

The Education Committee of the Area-Wide Council is the education-oriented arm of the organization which officially represents the population in the section of North Philadelphia designated by the city as its target area for participation in the federal Model Cities Program. Membership on the committee includes representatives of community organizations in the area and other interested citizens.

The committee has submitted a formal request to the school system that they become an "integral part of the total planning process" involving schools in the area. The superintendent of schools responded by issuing a memorandum to all top officials which stated in part, "Because they (Area-Wide Council) are the most broadly representative organization in the North Philadelphia area, they should be brought into all meetings and placed on all mailing lists having to do with educational programs in that area." Committee representatives have been active in planning a summer youth employment program and a new high school for the area. They also have received financial support from the school system to conduct a neighborhood survey of community attitudes toward school affairs and have worked with representatives of the school system and Temple University to establish an institute which will prepare teachers to teach in the model neighborhood.

The Ad Hoc Pickett Committee is comprised of citizens of Germantown and West Mt. Airy, two integrated middle-class neighborhoods. The efforts of this group began in 1966 when it was learned that a new middle school was to be built in Germantown. The Ad Hoc Pickett (for Clarence S. Pickett Middle School) was formed out of concern that the school not be located on a site which would encourage de facto segregation and that parents be closely involved with the school program. For almost a year, the committee met as a whole or in subcommittees (sometimes with school officials) to discuss every phase of planning the design of the building, choosing a principal and teachers, selecting curriculum content, and working out after-school programs. Several important committee recommendations have been accepted by school officials including the appointment of a principal whom the committee had helped to identify.

The Ad Hoc committee completed its work by the end of the 1967-68 school year. At that point it submitted a proposal to the board of education to create an on-going school advisory mechanism. The board of education approved this resolution subject to review of committee performance at the end of the year. The committee will include ten elected parents, three teachers, the principal, eight representatives of civic and community groups in the neighborhood, and three members of the original Ad Hoc Pickett Committee to ensure continuity and full exchange of information. Responsibilities of the committee will be to review and evaluate programs presented by the community and the principal, decide which recommended programs they desire and suggest these programs to the principal, and "establish in collaboration with the principal criteria for the evaluation of his leadership." The committee and the district superintendent will use these criteria and "share equally an official annual review of the principal's performance." The principal will have opportunity to discuss these evaluations as well as the right to appeal them ultimately to the superintendent of schools if he desires. Sole responsibility to select and evaluate teachers will rest with the principal.

Rochester, New York

The School Parent Advisor for the Neighborhood (SPAN) is a non-professional employee of the school system who lives in the inner-city and serves as liaison and resource person to both the school and home. The school system has employed several persons in this capacity following a suggestion by the local CORE chapter in 1966. Activities of the advisors include serving as a communications link between parents and school people, providing advice and encouragement to parents with school-related problems, interpreting family problems to teachers to improve their understanding of behavior by particular children, and serving as a stimulus and catalytic agent among social and welfare agencies in the community which can benefit individual students and their families.

The Community Teacher Program is an extension of the school into homes in inner-city neighborhoods and is closely related to the SPAN program. Community teachers go directly to homes where, with the assistance of the parent, they provide learning experiences for pre-school, kindergarten, exempted, and suspended children. The program has been directed especially to families which are typically hard to reach and reject traditional in-school programs. Each community teacher is responsible for recruiting her own student groups, arranging for the home or homes in which the program activities are carried out, and for setting up and operating the program.

The Lay Advisory Board for Community Education Centers has been established to review plans, suggestions, and consider candidates for acting director of community education centers planned for 1969. These centers will provide remedial, enrichment, and cultural activities for children and adult inner-city residents. During the summer of 1968, a neighborhood survey was conducted to assess citizen preferences for program activities at these centers. The results of this survey have been used as a basis for planning by the ten member lay advisory board. The present advisory board which is temporary was appointed on the basis of recommendations from residents of the neighborhoods to be served, SPAN advisors, principals, and teachers. A permanent advisory board will be formed after the centers are established. This board will be comprised of five citizens elected from the neighborhoods served by each of the centers and five members appointed by the board of education.

Rockford, Illinois

The Save Our Children Committee (SOC) was formed in the spring of 1968 as a citizen effort to remedy undesirable conditions at a ghetto junior high school. The nucleus of the SOC Committee was a small group of community organization leaders and parents whose children attended Washington Junior High School. As many as 500 people from the neighborhood were mobilized at various times and considered members of the committee. Leaders of the group met frequently with administrators at the Washington School and with central office officials. They also attended and made presentations to board of education meetings and used the Westside Community Organization and the Washington Community Center as forums for solidifying internal committee support.

The SOC committee protested low student achievement and harsh disciplinary treatment attributed to some faculty members. They presented a list of demands to the board of education which called for the reduction of class sizes, teachers who were knowledgeable about the heritage and living conditions of black people, recognition of minority group achievements in the curriculum, more black teachers, counselors, and administrators, more male teachers, special classes in discipline for students and parents, establishment of a community relations department, and establishment of a neighborhood controlling board. Following a period of negotiating with the board of education and superintendent (during which a one day students' boycott and several days of picketing took place) an agreement was reached satisfactory to the SOC committee and the board of education. This agreement called for special efforts to improve the educational program at Washington Junior High School (including permission to transfer for any teacher who would prefer to teach elsewhere in the system), the establishment of a neighborhood advisory board and the introduction of an ombudsman to the school community.

The Washington Community School Program was the product of negotiations between school officials and the SOC committee. Citizen participation in the program is accomplished through the neighborhood advisory board and the ombudsman. The advisory board was appointed by the Rockford Board of Education. Several of the advisory board members were active with the SOC group. The advisory board composed its original set of by-laws in October, 1968. Things which they had done by that time included interviewing and selecting candidates for the position of ombudsman and his field assistants, considering ways to expand citizen involvement in school activities, helping to plan and conduct a week long orientation for teachers of the Washington

School before school opened, and calling local problems to the attention of school officials. Sample problems include parental concern for growing prejudice of black students against whites, a local "protection racket," which plagued some of the smaller children in the neighborhood, concern that disciplinary procedures be forthright and impartial, and a number of ill-founded rumors which needed to be squelched in the community.

The role defined for the ombudsman is that of a liaison and mediator between the school and the community. Although paid by the school system, he and his two field assistants theoretically are responsible to the advisory board and the community at large. The ombudsman is not responsible to the Washington School principal; their mutual relationships are advisory and consultative. The present ombusdman was one of the key organizers of the SOC committee. He has spent most of his time talking with parents about problems which their children have at school, bringing representatives of the schools and local social and welfare agencies to aid needy students, establishing a series of new student extra-curricular activities, bringing community grievances to the attention of school officials, working with individual teachers on improving their knowledge of and relationships with the community, and serving as a staff arm for the advisory board.

The Pupil Placement Committee grew out of a citizen's protest to a board of education proposal that a group of lower class white high school students be bussed past a predominantly upper-middle class school to a more heterogeneous school which already was experiencing some inter-racial difficulties. The mother of a student in the proposed receiving school, appeared before the board of education in the spring of 1967 to protest that equality of educational opportunity could not be enhanced by segregating students according to socio-economic status. Two members of the board had given this matter previous thought, and, in response to the mother's remarks, the board appointed a committee "to study the basis of pupil placement in Rockford." All committee members were appointed by the board of education and the 27 member citizens group elected its own officers.

Members of the committee took their charge seriously and spent much time preparing their report. They were given staff assistance by the school administration. The report of the committee substantiated claims of extreme differences in achievement levels among schools and associated variations in student achievement with demographic variables. A section in this report which contained median achievement scores for each school pointed out the low ranking of Washington Junior High School and served as a rallying point for the SOC committee. The Pupil Placement Committee called city-wide attention to basic school problems.

The Pupil Placement Committee has been discharged but a follow-up committee was appointed and asked to submit recommendations dealing with pupil placement by January of 1969. Membership on this committee has been opened to anyone in the city who is interested, and the group has been meeting regularly.

The Responsible Citizens for Quality Education (RESQUE) was formed in the aftermath of the 1968 board of education elections. During the 1968 election campaign, board of education candidates were divided along clear lines. One group, the conservatives, campaigned in opposition to the policies of the superintendent. They opposed his contention that federal funds were necessary for the continued growth of the schools. Some called for his removal. The other group of candidates endorsed the policies of the superintendent and pledged support for certain innovative programs such as an in-service education center, the community school, and increased use of federal funds to support local programs. The three conservative candidates were elected by a wide margin.

Following this election, some citizens who had been active in the campaign for the defeated candidates felt the need to organize a group which would mobilize community support for the policies of the superintendent. Thus the Responsible Citizens for Quality Education (RESQUE) was organized. The major activity of RESQUE is publication of a bi-weekly newsletter. The stated purpose of this publication is "to bring facts about school policies, educational programs and problems to the attention of the community." In the words of the editor, "a community judgment based on facts would help improve the Rockford education system. One of the major roadblocks to improvements is the interjection of biases, rumors, and personalities in the educational system." Persons close to the group acknowledge their hope to be that individuals who read the newsletter will confront board of education members with information contained in it as a means of lobbying for particular educational programs.

San Francisco, California

The Community Education Planning Project (CEPP) was established in Ocean View-Merced Ingleside (OMI) which is a predominantly middle-class neighborhood in which sixty percent of the residents are black. Impetus for the project came from the OMI organization which is a federation of neighborhood groups. It has a number of standing committees, sponsors a wide range of community activities, and publishes a monthly newsletter. During the 1966-67 school year, the OMI education committee went to a local professor and school system officials for help in preparing an ESEA Title III proposal. The CEPP was awarded a planning grant and the principal of one of the five elementary schools in the area was designated planning director. The program developed by CEPP focused upon remedial reading and other compensatory efforts, was to be directed by school officials, and purported "to provide a setting in which teachers and parents can work together in an atmosphere of mutual trust and understanding to better meet the needs of the individual child."

3

The structure of the program calls for the director (a school administrator) to report to the assistant superintendent for innovative programs and to be superordinate to the project administrative council. During the planning year, eighteen of the twenty-three persons on the administrative council were professional educators. This structure was revised prior to the request for operating funds so the new administrative council is composed of thirty persons of whom fourteen will be community representatives including ten parents and four representatives of OMI.

In addition to supporting programs in reading and langauge arts, the project calls for the employment of five block club organizers. Block club organizers are selected by the administrative council from residents of the communities. They are responsible for facilitating the establishment of Block Action Clubs and for the identification of "block watchers." "A block watcher is to serve as a communications link between the school and the community...but they also constitute a powerful force for meeting and overcoming common problems." The functions of these groups are also described as "small neighborhood groups for social and information purposes; to expand the existence of block watchers who might well be called 'block mothers'; and to act as a community resource bank."

The Southeastern Educational Development Project (SEED), like the CEPP, is essentially a compensatory education program with a focus on elementary school reading programs. However, unlike the area served by OMI and the CEPP, the SEED project serves Hunters Point-Bayview which is not middle class but a conglomerate of public and low-cost housing projects populated mostly by poor and black people. The SEED project originated when school officials developed a proposal for federal funds early in 1968 which they took to the community for approval. The community, predominantly through the Hunters Point-Bayview Coordinating Council and the Hunters Point-Bayview Non-Profit Development Corporation, demanded that a number of significant changes be made before they would approve the proposal. A number of meetings ensued in which key community leaders negotiated community demands with school staff members, and a revised proposal was submitted to the U. S. Office of Education. Illustrative of the changes won by the community leaders was abandonment of the requirement that the project coordinator be a professional educator.

The SEED project was funded for three years. At each of the eight project schools, there is a parent review group made up of five parents of kindergarteners or first graders. This group is elected by parents. Its functions include electing one of its members to the SEED nominating committee (other members of this body include representatives from various community-wide groups, one teacher from each school in the project, and two administrators), and reviewing and assigning priorities to program proposals from persons involved with the local school program.

The nominating committee elects nine of its members (six community representatives and three school persons) to serve as the SEED project board of directors. The functions of the board of directors are to set general policy for the project (within the constraints of school board policy and state law), to employ the project coordinator and to review the employment of the supervisor of instruction, and to serve as a review committee for allocating $20,000 per school in discretionary funds to projects recommended by the parent review committees at the respective schools. Under the present structure, the project coordinator has responsibility for community oriented functions, and responsibility for schooling functions rests with the supervisor of instruction who is a certified employee of the board of education. The coordinator has no formal relationship to the superintendent or his staff and considers himself responsible to the SEED board of directors.